

INFANT SPRINKLING

PROVED TO BE

A HUMAN TRADITION;

BEING

THE SUBSTANCE OF A DEBATE

ON

CHRISTIAN BAPTISM,

BETWEEN

MR. JOHN WALKER, A MINISTER OF THE SECESSION,

AND ALEXANDER CAMPBELL, V. D. M.

A REGULAR BAPTIST MINISTER;

*Held at Mount Pleasant, Jefferson County, Ohio, on the
19th and 20th June 1820, in the presence of a very nume-
rous and respectable Congregation.*

TO WHICH IS ADDED,

A LARGE APPENDIX.

PUBLISHED BY ALEXANDER CAMPBELL.

"You make void the law of God by your traditions." "Teach-
ing for doctrines the commandments of men." *Jesus Christ.*

"But when divers were hardened and believed not, but spake
evil of *that way*, before the multitude, he (Paul) departed from
among them, and separated the disciples, *disputing* daily in the
school of one Tyrannus, and this continued for the space of
two years."

Acts of Apostles, 19. 9. 10

STEUBENVILLE, O.

PRINTED BY JAMES WILSON:

1820.

256/1952

District of Virginia, west of the Allegheny Mount. to wit:

BE IT REMEMBERED, that on the ninth day of August, in the 45th year of the Independence of the United States of America, A. CAMPBELL, of the said district, has deposited in his office the title of a book, the right whereof he claims as author, in the words following, to wit:

"*Infant Sprinkling proved to be a human tradition; being the substance of a debate on Christian baptism, between Mr. John Walker, a Minister of the Secession; and Alexander Campbell, V. D. M. a regular baptist minister, held at Mount Pleasant, Jefferson county, Ohio, on the 19th and 20th June 1820, in the presence of a very numerous and respectable congregation. To which is added, a large Appendix Published by A. Campbell — 'You make void the law of God by your traditions.' 'Teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.' Jesus Christ. — 'But when divers were hardened and believed not, but spake evil of that way, before the multitude, he (Paul) departed from among them and separated the disciples, disputing daily in the school of one Tyrannus, and this continued for the space of two years.' Acts of Apostles, 19, 9, 10.*"

In conformity to the Act of Congress of the United States, entitled, 'An Act for the encouragement of learning, by securing the copies of Maps, Charts, and Books, to the authors and proprietors of such copies, during the times therein mentioned,' and also of the act entitled 'An Act supplementary to an act entitled An act for the encouragement of learning, by securing the copies of maps, charts and books, to the authors and proprietors of such copies, during the times therein mentioned, and extending the benefit thereof to the arts of designing, engraving and etching historical and other prints.'

[SIGNED]

E. B. JACKSON,

Clerk of the District of Virginia, west of the
Allegheny Mountains.

258/1952
D154
C187W

To the Citizens of Mount Pleasant,

distinguished for the urbanity of their manners, their civic virtues, and their attachment to the principles of civil and religious liberty,

THE FOLLOWING NARRATIVE

of the Debate recently held in their flourishing village, is humbly dedicated, by the

WRITER,

as a small evidence of his grateful sense of their kind attention and hospitality-towards him, while attending the above debate.

That they may always enjoy the blessings of civil and religious liberty; and the present and future felicities, resulting from an intelligent mind, a well regulated and sanctified life, is the ardent wish of

Their humble servant,

ALEX. CAMPBELL

July 1st, 1820.

AN application being made to Mr. Findley, without effect, to obtain a copy of the Rules to be observed during the debate, I am obliged to publish the substance of them from recollection.

RULES.

1. Each speaker shall have the privilege of speaking 40 minutes without interruption, if he think proper to use them all, if not, he is not bound to speak so long.

2. Mr. Walker shall open the debate and Mr. C. shall close it.

3. The moderators are merely to keep order, not to pronounce judgment on the merits of the debate.

4. The proper subject of the ordinance of baptism, is first to be discussed—then the mode of baptism.

5. This debate must be conducted with decorum, and all improper allusions or passionate language guarded against.

6. The debate shall be continued from day to day, until the people are satisfied, or until the moderators think that enough has been said on each topic of debate.

ERRATA.

Page.	Line.	
2	19 from top,	<i>that</i> is superfluous.
6	3 from bottom,	for <i>take up</i> read <i>take it up</i> .
11	3 from top,	for <i>of</i> read <i>in</i> .
33	9 from bottom,	for <i>as</i> read <i>like</i> .
48	13 do.	for <i>or</i> read <i>on</i> .
49	20 do.	<i>to</i> is superfluous.
52	17 do.	for <i>me</i> read <i>one</i> .
67	21 do.	for <i>their</i> read <i>thc</i> .
106	10 from top,	for <i>as these, of pedo-baptists</i> , read <i>of pedo-baptists, as these</i> .
114	10 from bottom,	for <i>Corinthians</i> read <i>Cerinthians</i> .
122	7 from top,	for <i>has</i> read <i>have</i> .
127	2 from bottom,	for <i>they</i> read <i>in</i> .
130	6 from top,	for <i>is</i> read <i>are</i> .
—	14 do.	after <i>for</i> read <i>not</i> .
133	15 from bottom,	for <i>sit</i> read <i>fit</i> .
—	8 do.	for <i>a ting</i> read <i>to tinge</i> .
—	3 do.	for <i>ad vi</i> read <i>a vi</i> .
—	2 do.	for <i>obtinct</i> read <i>obtinet</i> .
141	6 do.	for <i>immerging</i> read <i>emerging</i> .
143	1 do.	for <i>sware</i> read <i>sure</i> .
174	10 do.	for <i>dedificrtion</i> read <i>dedication</i> .
178	read the 6th, 7th and 8th lines thus—The covenant at Sinai was to the covenant of circumcision, what the New Testament is to the Covenant of God in Christ promised to Abraham.	
190	2 from top,	for <i>minister</i> read <i>ministers</i> .
205	18 from bottom,	for <i>free</i> read <i>true</i> .

PREFACE.

IT is usual, and in many instances necessary, that he who writes for public inspection and edification, first introduces his subject, and sometimes himself, to the consideration of his readers, by a few preliminary observations. With this custom, I feel it my duty, on the present occasion, to comply. And in the first place, I would make my readers acquainted with the causes, that led to the discussion which is committed to the following pages.

A Mr. John Birch, a Baptist minister, and the elder of a Baptist church which meets on Flat Run, a few miles from Mount Pleasant, during last fall, baptized a more than usual number of professed believers. Mr. John Walker found it his duty to preach up infant Baptism, as an effectual mean to prevent the prevalence of Baptist principles. On one of those occasions, Mr. Birch accidentally heard Mr. Walker preach on this topic; and, hearing some quotations made by Mr. Walker, from Dr. Baldwin's Works, which Mr. Birch thought unfair, he took the liberty, after sermon, of asking Mr. Walker, to what part of Mr. Baldwin's works he had referred. This gave rise to a short dispute, on the meaning of the quotation, and, after some further interviews or correspondence upon the subject, it finally issued in Mr. Walker challenging Mr. Birch, or any regular Baptist minister, of good moral character and of good standing, whom Mr. Birch might choose, to come forward to a public debate upon that topic. Mr. Birch accepted the challenge, and immediately solicited my attendance. I hesitated for a little; but my devotion to the cause of truth, and my being unwilling even to appear, much more to feel, afraid or ashamed to defend the cause of truth, overcame my natural aversion to controversy, and finally determined me to agree to meet Mr. Walker, at the time and place above specified.

It is not to be expected that I could give, in detail, every word that was spoken during the debate: nor would this be profitable to the reader. If this could be done, it would exhibit much vain repetition, and many *little* things unconnected with the main subject of debate. The documents which I possess, will, however, authorise me to say, that a fair and full exhibition of all the arguments used on both sides, will be faithfully given; and, in many instances, the precise words. I have been favored with the notes taken by Salathiel Curtis, Esq. and with those taken by Mr. Thomas Campbell. I have also the minutes of Mr. Walker's arguments, which I noted down for reply whilst he was speaking. From all which documents, together with my own recollection, I hope and promise, to present to the public a correct and satisfactory detail of the whole proceeding.

It may be naturally supposed, that as there were so many witnesses, and from regions considerably remote, that a regard to my own character, (were I actuated by no higher motive) would induce me to give as accurate and as full a detail as possible. If any person on the opposite side of the question, should say that I have omitted some things, or given some unfair colorings, let him remember that the press is open—let him come forward and shew the public any unfairness of which he may suppose me guilty. I pledge myself that, when I am convinced, I will confess my error. If he cannot, if he does not do this, let him be silent, let him admit my statement and abide by the consequences resulting therefrom.

There are partizans, on all sides, who will ever have their own way of representing matters. There are some, however, that are not enlisted under the banners of any party. From these, alas! too generally, the most correct testimony on subjects of dispute is to be obtained. I am happy to say, that there was a considerable number of this class present at the late debate.

If any readers of the following sheets should complain that there is more recorded of what I have spoken upon the subject, than of the words of my opponent, I would inform him, that there are sundry reasons why more of what I have said should be recorded, than of the things spoken by him. These will appear more obvious in the sequel. One, however, I shall mention at present: I

spoke longer, and rather faster than my opponent—neither of us usually occupied the 40 minutes assigned us—but I, for certain reasons which will be obvious in the detail, occupied, excepting in one or two instances, a greater portion of them than Mr. Walker. Besides, the person who supports the negative of any question, has generally occasion to speak more than he who supports the affirmative. To illustrate this, I would suppose that A. undertakes to prove that the moon is made of green cheese; B. undertakes to shew that it is not. A. is called upon by B. to prove it. A. then proceeds to prove it; and adduces, in support of the affirmative, that as the moon is obviously the same size, the same shape, and the same color—ergo, it is a green cheese. Now B. who supports the negative, will require much longer time to open and expose the fallacy and sophistry of A.'s argument, than A. required to state it.

On my side, or rather the Baptist side, of the question, there is nothing to be proved. The Pede-Baptists themselves, admit that the Baptism which we practice, is Christian Baptism: they also maintain, that infant sprinkling is Christian Baptism; this we deny. A Baptist can present, in five minutes, a Divine warrant, an express command, authorizing his faith and practice; but, a Pede-Baptist requires days to prove his practice, and finally fails in the attempt. When we argue, or reason, with a Pede-Baptist, we have to wade through thick and thin after him, to pull him out of the mire of his own arguments. In every interview with him, we are engaged, when Baptism becomes the theme of discussion, in exposing to him the sophistry of his own reasoning; not in proving our own principles and practice. We only attempt to unloose the snares in which he has entangled himself; and it is, usually, more easy to entangle, than to disentangle any subject.

As there was a frequent recurrence to arguments, that seemed to have been obviously refuted; so the same arguments, sometimes in the same, and sometimes in a new dress, were brought forward. Sometimes, at intervals of hours, the same argument was resumed: which would render this record very confused and topsy-turvy, to take up in this way: sometimes five or six things would come together, in almost as many sentences. To instance this, I would mention, that the Covenant of Circumci-

sion, and the arguments drawn therefrom, occupied three fourths of the whole time of the debate. Mr. Walker introduced this on Monday, in his very commencement, and continued at it, now and then, until Tuesday at about 2 o'clock P. M. 'Tis true, there were sundry other things mentioned during this time; but the sweet theme and rallying point was the Covenant of Circumcision. Perspicuity and precision, as well as time and edification, require that I should bring together all that was said upon each topic, and let it all make its appearance together, in one place.

I was considerably disappointed in the temper and deportment of Mr. Walker—He conducted himself in a much more gentlemanly manner than I had anticipated; indeed, I had no sooner arrived in Mount Pleasant, than hints and insinuations were given, that an undue advantage was to be taken by Mr. Walker. By letters, some of which were anonymous, by cautions from persons unknown, on all hands, I was informed, that I might expect a complete brow-beating—All statements from strangers and acquaintances, concurred in this: that Mr. Walker had represented me as very irascible, and intended to throw me into a rage on the first onset, and thus triumph over me. In view of this, I understood the Seceders were elated, in the hopes of a speedy victory. But I can exhibit the plan proposed, and the feelings of the Seceders, much better, by transcribing one of those anonymous epistles which I received, by the hands of judge Martin, from some unknown person:

“ Mt. Pleasant, June 16, 1820.

“ SIR—Although you are an entire stranger to the writer of this note, yet he feels willing to apprise you of the advantage Mr. Walker designs to take, in the proposed debate on the subject of Baptism. We are told, by the friends of Mr. W. that he will have a decided advantage of Mr. Campbell. They say that Mr. C. is very irritable and easily thrown off his guard, and that Mr. W. is cool and dispassionate, and will, at the onset, endeavor to irritate, by using such language as is peculiarly calculated to produce that effect. By these and similar means, I presume that he and his friends anticipate certain victory.

“ And further—Mr. W. has, in a late public discourse,

in which he particularly alluded to this subject, endeavored to prepare the minds of the people, by laying down certain rules as evidence of defeat, among which he lays down this as an infallible criterion, viz. That whenever a man begins to shew signs of irritation, they may take it for granted, that that man feels himself outdone, and vents his spleen and chagrin by boisterous declamatory language. Whether this kind of reasoning be correct or not, I shall not pretend to decide; but hope, if you should be assailed in this way, you will be extremely on your guard, and not suffer yourself to shew any signs of irritation, even if you should be called sciolist, sophist, dogmatist, liar, or any other opprobrious epithet whatever. I am this moment informed, by a person in whom the greatest confidence can be placed, that in a late conversation with Mr. W. he informed him, that he understood that his opponent was very irascible, which would be all the better for him (to use his own words,) and for his part he was determined, let what would come, to keep cool—and that he engaged he (his opponent) should not want for provocation, if that was his disposition, &c. &c. I feel no kind of hostility to Mr. W. nor any other partiality to you, than to wish you may not have any undue advantage taken of you.

“Therefore, am yours,

“PHILO-JUSTITIAE.”

I would now recall to mind the advice of an ancient patriarch: “Let not him that putteth on his armour, boast as he that taketh it off.”

What diverted Mr. Walker from this plan, I know not, unless that he found, from an interview with me, of more than an hour, previous to the commencement, that I was not so irritable as he had anticipated. Be this as it may, he behaved well, and the debate closed with as much coolness and moderation, as had distinguished every period of its progress.

The debate was closed by myself: but, after I sat down, Mr. Samuel Findley, by an injudicious and unbecoming address, contrary to the rules by which he, as one of the moderators, should have been governed, produced an unpleasant excitement in the congregation. But as the public obviously and emphatically expressed their

disapprobation of it, I feel no desire, by a minute statement to perpetuate the remembrance of it.

I would repeat it, again, that Mr. Walker conducted his part of the debate, in a manner honorable to himself as a man: he failed in the support of his cause, only, because it was not tenable, or, in other words, because it was a bad one.

As I knew my Pedo-Baptist friends were sometimes accustomed to appeal to ancient languages and different versions of the Scriptures, as well as to Ecclesiastical History, I went forward duly prepared to meet them on those grounds. I wish, however, to observe, that the common version of the Scriptures, is sufficient to establish the truth of the Baptist views, independent of any other authorities. They receive, however, additional evidence in their favor, from every fair appeal to ancient languages and Ecclesiastical History. I took the following books, not to establish our cause, but to shew the nakedness of my opponent's: they are authorities of the most unexceptionable character, as they were written by authors, who either lived before the controversy on Baptism, or, with the exception of one, they were written by those who practised infant Baptism.

In the department of Ecclesiastical History, I took with me the following:

"The Genuine Epistles of the Apostolical Fathers, S. Barnabas, Paul's companion in travel, S. Ignatius, S. Clement, S. Polycarp, and the Shepherd of Hermas; being a complete collection of the most primitive antiquity, for about 150 years after Christ: translated from the original Greek, by William Lord, bishop of Lincoln, (a Pedo-Baptist.) London printed, 1710."

Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History, in one volume folio. This is the most ancient ecclesiastical history in the world. The title of it is as follows: "The history of the Church, from our Lord's incarnation to the 12th year of the emperor Mauricius Tiberius, or the year of Christ 594—as it was written in the Greek by Eusebius Pamphilus, bishop of Cæsarea, in Palestine; Socrates Scholasticus, native of Constantinople; and Evagrius Scholasticus, born at Epiphania, in Syria Secunda; translated and published at Paris, in the years 1659, 1668, and 1673. London printed, 1709."

Also, a History of Ecclesiastical Writers, containing

an account of the lives and writings of the primitive Fathers, an abridgement of other works, their various editions, and censures, determining the genuine and spurious. Also, a Compendious Account of the Councils, written in French, by Lewis Ellies Du Pin, Doctor of the Sorbon, and Regius Professor of Divinity at Paris. Dublin printed, 1723. (In 3 vols. folio.)

From these authorities, modern historians, such as Mosheim and Miller, have extracted such parts as they deemed expedient. In connection with the above, to meet any thing written by a partizan on the opposite side, I took Robinson's History of Baptism.

As authorities in the Greek language, I took with me, Stokii Clavis, Scapula the father of all the modern Greek Lexicons, and Parkhurst. The above three Lexicons are, with Screvelius, which I also used, the best, most approved, and most authoritative in the world. Along with these, I had with me a Greek, a Latin, and a French version of the New Testament—Dr. George Campbell's Translation of the Four Gospels; his Dissertations and Critical Notes; with sundry other books of minor importance. From these, and several others too ponderous to carry, I found myself able, satisfactorily to demonstrate the fallacy of all arguments deduced from Greek, Latin, Ecclesiastical History, and Tradition.

But, as frequent references shall be made to them in the debate, I forbear to insist any further, at present, on the merits of these authorities. There is no man versant in Ecclesiastical Antiquity, and ancient languages, that dare, or that will, call in question the authority of these writers, on those subjects on which I appeal to them.

With regard to the style in which this debate meets the public eye—being a narrative of extemporaneous effusions, it cannot be expected to possess either the elegance of diction, or the neatness of method, that should characterize a calm and deliberate composition. Besides, my time being engrossed in the arduous and constant duties of an extensive Seminary, I have not leisure to transcribe it even once. It must meet the public eye, in the plain garb in which it first flows from my pen; hoping, however, that it may be sufficiently intelligible, I humbly submit it without further apology.

DEBATE.

AS Mr. Walker gave the challenge, it became his duty to open the debate. This gave him the liberty of beginning at what part of the subject he pleased ; and of following any method he might have previously adopted. It also imposed upon me the necessity of following his method, and confined me to make replies to such arguments as he thought proper to introduce.

Mr. Walker commenced as follows :

My friends—I don't intend to speak long at one time, perhaps not more than five or ten minutes, and will therefore come to the point at once : I maintain that Baptism came in the room of circumcision—That the covenant on which the Jewish Church was built, and to which circumcision is the seal, is the same with the covenant on which the Christian Church is built, and to which Baptism is the seal—That the Jews and the Christians are the same body politic, under the same lawgiver and husband ; hence the Jews were called the congregation of the Lord—and the bridegroom of the Church says, “ My love, my undefiled is one ”—consequently the infants of believers have a right to Baptism.

To which I replied as follows :

Friends and fellow citizens—I arise to address you on this occasion, with some degree of diffidence, but with much satisfaction : I am diffident, when I consider how inexperienced I am in this mode of defending truth ; but pleased, very much pleased, with the opportunity I now have of opposing error, and of vindicating truth, in the presence of so many and so respectable auditors. I am aware of the peculiar difficulties which attend every attempt to exhibit unpopular truths, in the face of popular errors. We are all the subjects of passions and of prejudices. It is hard to obtain a momentary triumph

over either of them, but much more difficult to gain a complete victory over both. The only request I have to make, as, indeed, it is all I could reasonably expect of you, is, that you would exercise your patience and your impartiality. The subjects which are this day to be discussed, are interesting to us all. They are not the transient and fleeting concerns of this mortal state. They have an important bearing on endless futurity. They affect our present peace of mind, and our future felicity.

When I first heard that Mr. Walker had challenged the Baptist denomination, to prove to any minister of that denomination, that the sprinkling of an infant was a Divine Ordinance; although I admired his temerity, I was much gratified with the proposition. The man who comes forward publicly, to avow his sentiments, and to give his antagonist an opportunity of disputing them, face to face, in the presence of the public; in so far he merits my approbation. I never wish to adopt an opinion, or embrace an article of faith, that I would fear or blush to avow and maintain, in the presence of the world. "He that doeth truth," said the Messiah, "cometh to the light that his deeds may be made manifest that they are wrought in God. But he that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved."

The doctrine of Baptism is a topic, which very much agitates the religious public of this generation. The vast additions made to the Baptist denomination, both in Europe and America, has greatly alarmed the Pedo-Baptists on both sides of the Atlantic. Even some of themselves have affirmed, that unless some effectual check be put to the prevalence of these sentiments, they will, in less than half a century, universally prevail.

Although there is no doctrine more plainly taught in the New Testament, than the doctrine of Baptism, yet there are many professors of Christianity, at this day, and no doubt some in this assembly, labouring under conscientious embarrassments on this subject. To such, it is presumed, and fondly hoped, this debate may be of considerable advantage. And if there be any doctrine or practice of Christianity that may be lawfully the subject of such a discussion, I know of none more deserving the attention of the Religious Community than a debate on Christian Baptism. But why should I hesitate

on the lawfulness of thus vindicating truth and opposing error? Did not the great apostle Paul, thus publicly dispute with Jews and Greeks—with the leaders of Philosophy and Religion in his time? Yes; he publicly disputed with the Epicureans, the Stoics, the Jewish Priests, the Roman Orators, and openly refuted them. Nay, he disputed publicly in the school of One Tyrannus, two entire years, with all that came unto him. The Messiah himself, publicly disputed with the Pharisees and the Sadducees—the Priests and Rulers of the people. And by public disputation did Martin Luther, the celebrated reformer, wage war with the whole learning and see of Rome. By these means he begun and carried on the reformation—thus the poet sings:

—— Go, bid Alcides know,
His club, as Luther's tongue, gave no such blow.

And Heaven has stamped its probatum est, upon this method of maintaining truth.

I stand upon quite a different footing from my opponent. I once thought, as he thinks now. I was brought up in the strictest sect of Presbyterian religion, and had an implicit confidence in infant baptism, received by tradition from my forefathers. My change of principles has not been conducive to my wordly fame nor wordly interest. If I err, my error is both unprofitable and dishonorable in the region of my operations. If my opponent errs, his error is profitable and honorable. On this ground, then, I conceive myself much more open to conviction than he can be. I know his temptations, for I have felt the same. I would, in one point of view, be very glad to see as he sees, could conscience acquiesce. I judge him not; I speak from my own experience. "If, (says the Redeemer,) thine eye be single, thy whole body shall be full of light"—a single eye is of essential importance to a clear and full perception of Divine truth. These things premised, I proceed to consider the argument my opponent has submitted.

He has commenced with the trite, worn out argument, that has been many thousand times presented in support of his cause, and as many thousand times refuted. I cannot persuade myself to believe, that they who affirm that Baptism came in the room of circumcision, really ~~thought so~~ thought so, they would certainly

act more consistently than they do; that is, they would baptize none but males, the Jews circumcised none but males; they would baptize precisely upon the eighth day, for the Jews circumcised on the eighth day. They would baptize all the slaves or servants that the master of a household possessed, upon his faith, for the Jews circumcised all their slaves, all born in their house or bought with their money, on the footing of their covenant relation to Abraham. They would not confine the administration of Baptism to the clerical order, for men and women circumcised their own children. They would not confine Baptism to the infants of professed believers only, for the most wicked of the Jews had the same privileges with regard to circumcision, that the most faithful of their nation had. I have now specified five things in their practice, which differ from the practice of circumcision amongst the Jews. Why then does my opponent say that circumcision was done away, and that Baptism came in the room of it? Does he put Baptism in the room of it? Most assuredly he does not. Why then contend for any thing in principle and give it up in practice? I cannot, then, think that he and many others who practice the same way, really believe their own doctrine.

I will now sum up, in a few words, seven respects in which Baptism differs from circumcision, and thus give my opponent an opportunity of replying to them all together.—Baptism differs from circumcision: first, in the sex of its subjects—men and women were baptized—males, only, were circumcised. Secondly: it differs from circumcision in the age of its subjects—Baptism has no age specified for any of its subjects. In the third place, Baptism differs from circumcision in the prerequisites required to a participation in the ordinance: Circumcision required only carnal descent from Abraham, or covenant relation to Abraham—but Baptism requires no carnal relation to Abraham, it requires simply faith in Christ as its sole prerequisite—"If thou believest with all thine heart thou mayest"—no faith was required as a sine qua non to circumcision—but the New Testament presents faith, as a sine qua non to Baptism; Acts 8, 37. In the fourth place: Baptism differs from circumcision in the character of its administrator; parents, relatives, or civil officers, performed the rite of circumcision—thus Zipporah circumcised the ~~children of her~~

son of Moses, Ex. 4, 25. Joshua circumcised the Jews, Jos. 5, 3—Baptism is an ordinance connected with the ministry of Jesus Christ, and in the commission given to the Apostles, Math. 28, at the close, it is connected with teaching and preaching. In the fifth place: Baptism differs from circumcision in its emblematical import—Baptism is emblematical of our death unto sin, our burial with Christ, and our resurrection with him unto newness of life—Rom. 6th, 3 & 4, Col. 2d, 12. Circumcision was a sign of the separation of the Jews from all the human family, and it was a type of the death or circumcision of Christ—Col. 2, 11. Baptism, in the sixth place, differs from circumcision, in the part of the system that was the subject of the operation; Pedo-baptists apply water to the face; surely they do not suppose that the Jews circumcised in the face—Baptists apply water to the whole person—Neither Baptists nor Pedo-baptists apply baptism to the precise part affected in the rite of circumcision. In the seventh place: Baptism differs from circumcision in the blessings it conveys—Circumcision conveyed no spiritual blessings—Baptism conveys no temporal, but spiritual blessings—Baptism is connected with the promise of the remission of sins, and the gift of of the holy spirit—Circumcision had the promise of Canaan's land, and a numerous family, as its peculiar blessings. When Mr. Walker shall have shewn how these things can differ in so many respects, and yet be the same seals of the same covenant, or the latter a substitute for the former, I will then propose other differences between Baptism and Circumcision—until then, these will suffice.

With regard to what he has asserted, concerning the covenants being the same, I am authorised from the Old Testament and the New, to affirm that they are not; often have I seen Pedo-baptist writers assume this as a fundamental axiom of all their reasoning; as if it had been granted by the Baptists. Peter Edwards is distinguished amongst sophists, for such assertions; I am sorry that my opponent seems to follow him too closely. On what grounds does my opponent affirm that these covenants are the same, that is, what he calls the covenant of grace, or I the new covenant, and the covenant of circumcision. Do we not read that there were different covenants made with Abraham? One called by Stephen, the proto-martyr, the covenant of Circumcision—and one called by Paul,

in his epistles to the Gallatians, "the covenant confirmed before of God in Christ, which was 430 years before the giving of the law"—Why then call these two the same—the one revealed to Abraham when 75 years old, departing from Haran, Gen. 12, 3, 480 years before the giving of the law; the other made with Abraham when 99 or 100 years old, Gen. 17, called the covenant of circumcision? Why, I say, call these two, the Abrahamic covenant? And why say that these two are the same with that covenant on, which the church of Christ is built? Allowing my opponent to reply to what I have already said, particularly to the seven peculiarities in which baptism and circumcision differ—also to state more fully his views on these covenants, I sit down.

Mr. W. then proceeded as follows:

My opponent has made you a long speech—I don't intend to make long speeches, I keep to the point. He has mentioned certain respects in which circumcision differs from baptism. These I consider of little consequence. With regard to what he has said concerning the difference of sex, I would observe that Christ has a right to alter or add as he pleases; we are not to suggest to him who is, or who is not, to be added to his church; he has rather enlarged than diminished our privileges under the New Testament dispensation. Besides I consider that the covenants under which the Jewish and Christian churches exist, may be assimilated to a bond, which, the addition of a few names does not invalidate. The addition of a rite does not destroy the nature of that rite. If there are thousands of names added to a bond, it does not destroy the nature of the bond. Again, as to the age at which baptism is to be administered, I would say to parents, baptise your children as soon as you can. The reason why the Jews were not to circumcise till the eighth day, was that, according to the law, the Jewish mother was unclean seven days after the child was born, and could not accompany it to the sanctuary, until she was considered clean according to the law. There is none of that uncleanness now, therefore I would say baptise the child as soon as you can. Again, we read that the Jews were not confined to the eighth day, for they did not circumcise their children always at that age. We read in Joshua, that all that were born in the wilder-

ness were not circumcised until Joshua did it. So that for forty years circumcision was not practised on the eighth day—I grant that Zipporah circumcised her own son, but ministers of the gospel are to baptise. Ministers, only, are to administer sealing ordinances. I affirm that circumcision and baptism confer the same, or are seals of the same blessings. It is obvious that circumcision sealed spiritual blessings to Abraham, for, saith Paul, Rom. 4, 11, and he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of that faith, which he had yet being uncircumcised—Circumcision was then to Abraham a seal of saving faith—Circumcision confirmed temporal and spiritual blessings, and Baptism confirms both temporal and spiritual blessings—all our temporal as well as our spiritual blessings come through the righteousness of Jesus Christ—as the substance of Abraham's faith was the same as ours, and as circumcision was a sign and seal of it, so baptism is a sign of the same blessings.

Now, that the Jews and the Christians are the same body politic, and that the covenants are the same, appears from Rom. 11, 17, "And if some of the branches be broken off, and thou being a wild olive tree, were grafted in among them, and, with them, partakest of the root and fatness of the olive tree;" from this text it appears obvious, that the Christians were grafted in among the Jews, into the same stock and root—now grafting does not alter the nature of the tree into which the branches are ingrafted; consequently the Jews and Christians are the same body politic. The covenants are the same, and baptism came in the room of circumcision—See Gen. 17 and Gal. 5—"My love, my undefiled is one." As to the covenants that we have heard of, I consider that the covenant of grace was that covenant to which circumcision was a seal. That the Abrahamic covenant was the covenant of grace, cannot, I think, be denied, seeing it sealed spiritual blessings; therefore I consider these objections of my opponent of no consequence, nor do they invalidate what I have already said, that infant membership was instituted in the church—that infants had once a right to it, and this right has never been taken away, but by the Baptists.

To which I then rejoined:

My antagonist has attempted to remove some of those objections which I have made to his assumption "that

Baptism came in the room of circumcision." Some of those differences he has not touched, and with what success he has attempted others you will immediately see. In the first place, with regard to the extending baptism to females contrary to the use of circumcision. This embarrassment to his system, he would remove by asserting, without evidence or proof, that our privileges are greater now than formerly, and consequently baptism should be extended to females. We Baptists affirm that females have a right to baptism, because we are positively informed in the New Testament, that men and women were baptised—but upon the hypothesis of its coming in the room of circumcision, there is no right for female baptism. To tell us that our privileges are now enlarged, is poor logic to prove any proposition—it proves too much. If there be no specification of those items in which our privileges are enlarged—upon this principle we might innovate without end; and if any person asked us why, we might tell them, Our privileges are now enlarged. What my opponent means by this bond, I do not rightly understand—who are the contracting parties, and what are its specifications, and what is the meaning of adding names to it?

With regard to the embarrassment arising from the age of the subjects of circumcision, my opponent comes off by saying, that the uncleanness of the mother postponed it to the eighth day—that upon the eighth day she might approach the sanctuary. To shew you the fallacy of this come off, I shall read you the verse to which he alludes: Leviticus 12, 2-4—"If a woman have borne a man child, she shall be unclean seven days, according to the days of the separation of her infirmity, and on the eighth day, the flesh of his foreskin shall be cut off, and she shall then continue in the blood of her purifying thirty-three days, she shall touch no hallowed thing, *nor come into the sanctuary*, until the days of her purifying be ended." This is a flat contradiction of my opponent's views—but I would add that circumcision was fixed upon the eighth day, 400 years before legal uncleanness was instituted. And with regard to their not circumcising on the eighth day, for forty years, while travelling to Canaan, it is nothing to the purpose, for this plain reason, that circumcision, during this period, was entirely given up. It was performed at no age—Josh. 5 & 5, "All

the people that were born in the wilderness, by the way, as they came forth out of Egypt, them they had not circumcised." During their peregrinations, they could not, in consequence of the pain attending this rite, attend to it. But this does not prove that they might, with impunity, have at any time postponed it to the sixteenth, twentieth, or sixtieth day. We find that, in the most corrupt state of the Jews, they kept this ordinance pure. In the days of John the Baptist and the Messiah, it was punctually performed upon the eighth day.

There are four of the embarrassments I proposed, Mr. Walker has not attempted to remove; the difference of the administrators—the difference of the pre-requisites to these ordinances—the difference in the part of the body affected by the rite, and the difference in their emblematical import. In relation to the blessings sealed or conveyed in these ordinances, he asserts that they are the same—alike temporal and spiritual; this I confidently deny.

Circumcision conveyed only temporal blessings to the Jews—It guaranteed that they should be a numerous and powerful people, that God would be their king, and that they would individually have an inheritance in the land of Canaan: But Baptism promises the remission of sins, and the gift of the Holy Spirit; this did not circumcision. Mr. W. refers to Rom. 4, to shew that it was a sign and seal of spiritual blessings; but the apostle's object in that chapter was entirely different—his object was to shew that men are justified by faith without works.—It is always unfair reasoning to use arguments for another purpose, or for any purpose, contrary to the design of the writer, and the scope of his reasoning. Paul was shewing, that even Abraham, the father of the faithful, received the promise of all spiritual blessings previous to his circumcision; yea, twenty-five years before he was circumcised—and that "Circumcision was a sign and seal of that righteousness, which he had yet being uncircumcised." Now I know of no passage more obviously against my opponent, for it goes to shew, that circumcision was to Abraham what it never was, nor could be, to any of his posterity. Will my opponent say that circumcision was to Ishmael, to Isaac, or to any of the infant offspring of Abraham, what it was to him? Was it a sign and seal to Isaac, or to Ishmael, of a righteousness

which they previously possessed? The only fair and unexceptionable interpretation of this passage is, that Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him righteousness: This happened, Gen. 12, 3, when he was 75 years old. His being marked out by circumcision as the father of the promised seed, was to him a sign or token; and a seal or confirmation, that his faith was approved of God; and it is to this day a sign or token to all the world that his faith was approved, and that he was justified by it, inasmuch as he was thereby made the father of the promised seed, and the father of all them that ever after inherit the same faith—But to say that it was to all the circumcised the same, or to one of them the same, he only excepted, is destitute of all proof, and contradictory to fact—It is a sophism of the first magnitude—It is drawing a general conclusion from a particular premise. Suppose I should say that because this 19th of June is a clear day, and the wind north-west, that every 19th of June till the world shall end, shall be a clear day, and the wind shall be north-west—who would not discover the sophistry of my reasoning?—As sophistical is the reasoning of my opponent. Again, it is entirely contrary to fact. Was circumcision a seal of spiritual blessings to Ishmael, to Korah, Dathan, and Abiram? was it to Nadab and Abihu? Was it to Saul? Was it to the Jews that crucified the Messiah?—Yet they were all the apparent and the proper subjects of it. What circumcision was to one of Abraham's seed, it was to all his seed—according to the covenant made with him, Gen. 17, it secured temporal blessings to them all. There is also another difference betwixt the import of circumcision to Abraham and his seed. To Abraham it secured that his seed should positively inherit that land, and that according to the tenor of that covenant, "God would be their God"—But it did not positively secure to all the circumcised even this—but only provisionally, for many of them might die the day after they were circumcised and never inherit any of its temporal blessings; besides many of them might live and break that covenant, and therefore forfeit the enjoyment of its blessings, and many of them did so. So that it was only provisionally a seal to any of the seed of Abraham, when they received it; but to Abraham it was a positive confirmation that his seed would inherit those temporal blessings. But baptism secures to all its

proper subjects, the promise of all spiritual blessings from the moment they receive it. This is another difference, and I now call it the eighth difference betwixt circumcision and baptism.

It appears to me a gross departure from analogy, from the meaning of Jewish rites, and from matter of fact, to say "that Baptism came in the room of circumcision." The sacred scriptures do not, as far as I can understand them, ever lead us to think that one rite came in the room of another; but they teach us that Christ came in the room of all Jewish rites—he is our passover, our circumcision and our sacrifice. "In whom we are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands—by the circumcision of Christ," Col. 2. Christ is the substance of all rites and emblems: he is the great antetype of all Jewish types.

I would also ask my opponent—If baptism came in the room of circumcision, why were so many thousands of the Jews baptised who had previously been circumcised? This, on the principles of my opponent, was a mere tautology. If baptism and circumcision are alike, the same seals of the same covenant, why administer both to the same subjects? Three thousand, on the day of Pentecost, were baptised, or, in the language of my opponent, they were sealed into the covenant of grace, into which they had been sealed when 8 days old. Upon the same principle, if all the Jews had lived to that time, and believed, they would all have been baptised. What would have come of their circumcision then?

With regard to the "covenant of circumcision," and the "covenant confirmed of God in Christ," the latter being revealed to Abraham 25 years before the former was made with him, and the latter being 430 years before the giving of the law—my opponent appears not to understand this difference; it appears it has never entered into his views, upon this topic, and so far as I can judge from appearance, it is a strange and a new thing to him; I will therefore be at a little pains to state it more fully.

Gen. 12, 3—"In thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed," is what Paul, Gal. 3 and 8, calls the gospel; and, in the seventeenth verse, he calls it the covenant confirmed before of God in Christ, 430 years before the giving of the law. The 8th verse reads thus: "And the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the hea-

then through faith, preached before the Gospel unto Abraham, saying, 'in thee shall all nations be blessed.'"—Now this is what my opponent calls the covenant of grace; but as I prefer scripture names where they can be obtained, I choose rather, with the apostle, to call it 'the covenant confirmed of God in Christ,' or 'the new covenant,' or 'the Gospel.' This, then, is as distinct from that covenant to which circumcision was attached, as any two things in the Bible. The covenant of circumcision was not made until 25 years after, until Abraham was 99 or 100 years old—Gen. 17. How then my opponent, and Peter Edwards and his followers, can call these two one, and argue from them as one and the same, is a blunder that is too glaring in this enlightened age. Paul calls them "the covenants of promise," he uses the plural; they call them the covenant of grace, making them singular. Whatever the apostle calls them, he preserves the same number—"To whom," says he, "pertain the covenants of promise"—again, "To Abraham and his seed were the promises made." On these two covenants, which are of such ancient date, are the two dispensations founded; the Jewish and the Christian.

On the covenant of circumcision was predicated the national or Sinai covenant, which erected the seed of Abraham into a typically holy nation, by which they were said to be married to the Lord. This Sinai covenant, was made 405 years after the covenant of circumcision—See Exodus 19, compared with Heb. 8.

On the covenant confirmed before of God in Christ, 430 years before the giving of the law, was predicated the New Testament, which presents a new and full exhibition of divine mercy, extending to the Gentiles also; by means of which the spiritual seed of Abraham are associated into a new and spiritual relation called the church of Christ. [On these two covenants I intend to enlarge more fully in the appendix.]

If my opponent rightly appreciated the difference betwixt these two covenants, and understood the important place they hold through the whole Bible, he would forever abandon all arguments drawn from the covenant of circumcision to prove infant baptism.

When I hear any pedit-baptist pleading for the baptism of infants upon the footing of the faith of the parents, that is on the footing of carnal generation; it brings to my re-

collection the reply that John the Baptist made to the Jews who solicited baptism, upon the footing of the faith of their great, great, great, many times great, grandfather, Abraham. They were as confident of the validity of their claims, as any modern Pede-baptist; they came forward with an ostentatious parade of hereditary excellence—"We have Abraham to our father," was their cogent argument; how did John receive it? "O generation of vipers! Who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come?—Bring forth fruits meet for repentance—think not to say within yourselves, 'we have Abraham to our father'—I say unto you, God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham." In this transaction, methinks I see the arguments of my opponent drawn from covenant relation to Abraham, or from circumcision, fully exposed, and perfectly refuted.

Before I sit down, I would express my fears that too large a portion of our time will be spent on the Abrahamic covenants, and that other important matters will be pushed out of view. In the mean time, I would remind Mr. Walker, that the seven points submitted to his consideration, yet remain unanswered. I would entreat him to try them a second time—they yet remain with rather additional force against him.

Mr. Walker then arose, and spoke to the following effect:

This bond, which I used as an illustration of my views, Mr. C. seems not to comprehend. I will endeavor to make it more plain to him. A bond is a contract betwixt two parties; so is a covenant. Now, as I have already said, the covenant which had circumcision as its seal, is the same as the new covenant or covenant of grace. And, as infants were once entitled to church membership under this covenant, so they are yet. The adding of many names to a covenant or bond, does not alter the nature of the transaction; it merely interests them in the things promised or specified in the bond, the bond remains the same.

He has said we live under a new dispensation, and on this he lays great stress. He should know, that this new dispensation is only a new form of the old one, or a new exhibition of its substance. The difference betwixt the old and the new, is far from so important and so great,

as my opponent seems to think. All things are substantially the same under both. Do we not see from the apostle's reasoning, in the 11th to the Romans, that he considered the Jews and Christians as the same body politic? My opponent has not attended to what I have said on this chapter. He seems afraid to meddle with this chapter—it is so decidedly against his views. In it, the Apostle shews that the Jewish church was not dissolved, that the Gentiles were merely received into it. The Gentiles were incorporated with the Jews, and became one body with them; they were, in one word, brought into the Jewish church. Into this church circumcision was once the door, by it infants once entered in. Baptism is now the door, and by it infants now enter in. If, then, I can make this appear—if I can shew that the apostle considered them the same church, and that infant membership was never taken away—I say, if these things can be established, the Divine right of infants to baptism is established, notwithstanding all that my opponent has said concerning the differences between circumcision and baptism. Let us now hear the apostle, Rom. 11, 17, “And if some of the branches be broken off, and thou being a wild olive tree were grafted in among them, and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive tree,” verse 24—“For if thou wert cut out of the olive tree, which is wild by nature, and were grafted contrary to nature, into a good olive tree, how much more shall these, which be the natural branches, be grafted into their own olive tree?” Is it not obvious, then, from the apostle's reasoning, that the olive tree denotes the visible church state of the Jews—and that the Jews, themselves, were the natural branches? The Gentiles, who are represented as the wild olive, were contrary to nature grafted in among the Jews, that is, they were brought into the Jewish church, or were brought into the same church state as the Jews. And the Jews, if they continue not in unbelief, shall be grafted into their own olive tree or church state again. We see, from the above, that the Jewish church still continued, and as the Gentiles were converted they were incorporated with them. I wish, then, that my opponent would advert to this, and no longer tell us, that the Christian church is radically different from the Jewish; which we have now proved to be one and the same.

Mr. C. has asked again, what spiritual blessings did circumcision seal to the Jewish nation. To answer his question again, I must refer to Rom. 4, 2—12. Let him consider this chapter, and he will see that not only to Abraham, but to David also, circumcision sealed spiritual blessings. It was a seal to David, of the forgiveness of his sins, as well as to Abraham of the righteousness of his faith. It is no objection to my system, that circumcision did not seal spiritual blessings to all the subjects of it; for Baptism did not seal spiritual blessings to all its subjects. What spiritual blessings did Baptism seal to Simon Magus, who was a member of the visible church, and a proper subject of Baptism according to my opponent?

Again; the infants of the Jews, though they might receive no immediate advantage from circumcision, yet they were bound thereby to keep the whole law; and if they did so, they would receive spiritual blessings in so doing. It laid them under an obligation of obedience, as long as they lived; so does Baptism oblige all children to observe the laws of God, which, if they do, they shall doubtless receive the blessedness of which David partook, and the righteousness which Abraham possessed. By this covenant of circumcision I will stick, it is a main pillar of my argument, I will not be coaxed from it by my opponent—I must still maintain that circumcision was a seal of the covenant of grace, and conveyed spiritual blessings to those who partook of it.

[The above is the substance of what Mr. Walker spoke in two of those periods which he employed. In reply to which, I subjoin the substance of my remarks in two succeeding periods:]

I cannot but admire the ingenuity of my opponent, in evading the consideration of those insuperable difficulties which I have thrown in the way of his system. He reiterates the same things under scarcely a new garb, which are plainly refuted in the arguments against his views, which I have already submitted. While agreeing upon the preliminaries of this debate, previous to commencement this morning, I foresaw, I anticipated, that this day would be spent, and the attention of this congregation wearied, in just such a controversy as you have heard. Is it possible that my opponent has no better support for

his system! Is he obliged to prove a New Testament positive institution, from the 17th chapter of Genesis! from portions of scripture in which Baptism is never mentioned! In all the scriptures he has yet adduced, Baptism is not so much as once mentioned! What is the meaning of this? Either, he wishes to keep us from attending to the plain portions of scripture pertaining to the subject, by an abstruse disquisition on portions of scripture inapplicable to the main subject of debate; to perplex and weary your attention: or, he has no better support for his views. I am determined that the day shall not be spent, in such foreign and unedifying discussions. The forty minutes which are assigned me to speak, are my own; I shall occupy them as I please. I will spend a certain portion of them in refuting his assertions, the remainder of them I will appropriate to other topics illustrative of the subject in dispute. I will attend to every thing he advances, worthy of notice; but I will do more: I will endeavor to elucidate the subject by other arguments and considerations, than those which he may please to introduce.

With the advantage of all that Mr. W. has said, on his favorite illustration, the Bond, I am at a loss to understand him. He seems to assert, that the adding of names to the bond, interests those names in the privileges of the bond—that the rite of circumcision, or the rite of Baptism, is the seal of this bond. This similitude appears to me to obscure, rather than to elucidate, his side of the question; for, according to him, the bond is a perfect blank at the time of signing and sealing. The infant that receives the seal, or, according to him, who seals the bond, (for the person that seals a bond is always active, never passive) has nothing guaranteed or secured to him at the time of sealing; his name is affixed to it, before the items are specified; and after fifteen or twenty years the items are written; for he admits, that Baptism does secure nothing to an infant at the time of administration. It depends entirely upon the subsequent conduct of the baptized, whether he ever receives any benefit from it. This is a novelty, to me at least, in Bond transactions; first seal the bond, and afterwards specify the items.*

* A respectable gentleman of the bar, to whom I had the pleasure of being introduced during an interval of the debate, made the following criticism on this similitude of the bond. He

The sealing of a bond is an expression of the consent of the parties as well as a ratification of the articles. How, then, an uninformed infant mind can be supposed to express its consent to the stipulations of a transaction, of which it never had an idea, in receiving the seal of Baptism, as it is called, is what, I confess, I cannot comprehend. I must, then, refer this similitude to those who are endowed with a degree of penetration of which I was never possessed.

I must next endeavor to consider the arguments which Mr. W. has used to shew us, that the Jews and Christians are one and the same church. It is a misfortune, which, I discover, very much attends the system of my opponent—that he is obliged to quote such scriptures, as never clearly mention the subject which he designs to prove from them. Perhaps this may be to display his ingenuity, in exhibiting mysteries not evident to people of common understanding. To prove infant Baptism is a hard task, seeing there is not a word of it in the Bible; it is, however, a pleasant theme to a man of ingenuity; it requires him to prove sundry things that are not mentioned in the Bible. One of these he has lately attempted, viz: To prove that the Jewish nation and Christian church are one and the same church. Of course he must lead us to some metaphorical passage of scripture, in which the thing is not so much as mentioned—thus is the 11th chapter to the Romans. This chapter, he would lead you to suppose, was very much in his favor, and very formidable to my views. I did not attend to it when first suggested, because it required too much time, and because his remarks upon it appeared no way conclusive.

The apostle Paul, in his 11th chapter to the Romans, had one design, and my opponent, in citing it, has another.

observed, that Mr. Walker's argument from a bond, was predicated upon a gross mistake of the true nature of a bond. It is very bad logic, said he, to say that the adding of names to a bond does not alter the nature of a bond, but merely interests the names added in the privileges or obligations of the bond, for if there were a thousand names or only one, added to a bond, it would avail those names nothing, unless there were some specifications in the bond concerning them. It is the specifications in the bond, and not the mere circumstance of subscription, that is entitling. I observe, continued he, that some of you gentlemen of the pulpit, do not reason with as much precision as we gentlemen of the bar.

The apostle's design, as is unquestionably evident from his remarks in the beginning of the chapter, was, to shew that God had not cast away and finally rejected his Jewish people; although a great majority of them were cast away. The Apostle proves that there was a remnant, according to the election of grace, that God had not cast away. My opponent's design in summoning the evidence of the apostle, is to prove that the Jewish nation, the whole of it as such, was the same as the Christian church. To say nothing of the unfairness of the attempt, which must strike the attention of every reflecting mind, I would observe, that, in my humble opinion, this chapter is decidedly against my opponent's system. In the first place, it must be confessed by all Christendom, and this chapter asserts it, that the whole Jewish nation was rejected from that peculiar relation in which they once stood to God; with the exception of a small remnant; according neither to birth, blood, nor merit, but according to the election of grace. This is a fact which, I presume, no man professing christianity will deny. Another fact, equally obvious from the New Testament, is, that this remnant according to the election of grace, *did not continue in the same visible state*, in which they formerly existed. This remnant was the root or beginning of the Christian church. This remnant had no priest, no prophet, no king, no temple, no altar, no sacrifice, but the crucified Jesus. They *continued not* in their ancient Jewish state and customs, but, Acts 2d, 42d, they *continued stedfastly* in the Apostle's doctrine, in breaking of bread, in fellowship, and in prayers. To this society of Jews, this remnant, according to the election of grace, the Lord added the saved daily." This was called the first Christian church—Acts 2, 47. A third fact I will mention obviously stated in this 11th to the Romans, and uniformly acted upon, in the ministry of John the Baptist, the ministry of Jesus Christ, and the ministry of the Apostles, in planting churches—it is this—32d verse, "The Lord hath concluded them all in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon them all." In relation to the Gospel Dispensation, the whole Jewish nation, as well as the whole Gentile world, were concluded in unbelief—that the same mercy might be shewn to all. Even the remnant of the Jewish nation that became Christian, was concluded under unbelief for a time, that the same mercy

might be manifest in forming them Christian, that shone conspicuous in christianizing the Gentiles. Hence, the "Doctrine of repentance towards God, and faith in Jesus Christ," was uniformly preached to Jew and Gentile without one shade of difference, excepting in the order of these words, "to the Jew first, and also to the Greek." Not one solitary Jew, of the whole nation, was admitted into the kingdom of the Messiah, or Christian church, until he possessed a faith and underwent a change of heart he never before experienced. Even Nathaniel, an Israelite indeed, in whom there was no guile, was enlarged in his mind, exercised a new faith, and had other discoveries, which he never before possessed, previous to his becoming a Christian. Hence, John the Baptist "prepared a people for the Lord" by teaching them that a new state of things was to be instituted. Jesus Christ himself, and his Apostles, preached the same doctrine, saying, "repent ye, for the kingdom of Heaven is at hand."

In the sense of these observations, the least Christian, or "the least in the kingdom of Heaven, was a greater prophet than John the Baptist." The whole Jewish nation, in what Mr. W. calls "their visible church state," was concluded in unbelief; and the necessity of faith and repentance preached to them individually, in order to admission into the kingdom of Jesus Christ, or Christian church. The 120 Disciples converted previous to the day of Pentecost, and the three thousand converted on that day, forming the first Christian church that existed on earth, were concluded in unbelief for a time, and not without repentance and faith were they Christianized.—From these facts, on which I may hereafter enlarge, the radical distinctness of the Christian church state, is plainly proved, and shewn to be essentially dissimilar to the "visible church state of the Jews."—I do seriously entreat all pedit-baptists to consider these three facts. They are plain and decisive. The whole New Testament is predicated upon them. The first of them, viz. that the Jews, as a nation, were cast away and rejected, as being the people of God, on those peculiar accounts, which designated them "his people," made way for the reconciling of the world, became "the riches of the Gentiles," and introduced a new era in the world; the constitution of a new state of things. The second of them, viz. that the "remnant according to the election of

grace," *continued not* in the former state of the Jewish nation, but became the people of God in a spiritual and everlasting relation, essentially distinct from their former state, is the accomplishment of many promises and prophecies in the Old Testament, and fitly characterizes the Christian church, "the kingdom of Heaven;" in comparison of the "worldly sanctuary," the "carnal commandments," and the "beggarly elements" of the Jewish state. The third and last of these three, viz. that Jews and Gentiles were, to a man, concluded in unbelief in relation to Christianity, presents the whole world on the same footing. It presents Judaism and Gentilism as both distinct from, and essentially opposite to, Christianity. In the language of John the Baptist, "it levels mountains, exalts vallies, makes rough paths smooth, and crooked ways straight"—"It puts no difference between the Jew and the Greek, for the same Lord over all is rich in mercy unto all that call upon him." Whether, then, shall we interpret those figurative representations of things, pertaining to these facts mentioned in the 11th to the Romans, according to any system which we may embrace; or according to these facts, which are not the views of any party; but which are admitted by Baptists and Pede-baptists? Most assuredly, our interpretation of metaphors, must bow to facts, and not facts bow, for they are too stubborn to bow, to our private interpretations.* I now proceed to exhibit my views of those parts of this chapter cited by Mr. W. and I hope, in no instance will they be found either to contradict fact or to deviate from the obvious meaning of words and scope of sacred truth.

* Distinguished commentators have found it extremely difficult to comprehend every thing the Apostle says in this 11th chapter. Therefore we find the ablest of them differing among themselves. One cause of this difficulty, I presume, is the Apostle's so frequently referring from one part of the subject to another—so often stating and applying his remarks in sudden transitions from Jews to Gentiles. Another difficulty in expounding the metaphors is, that the engrafting spoken of, appears to be predicated upon a mistaken view of grafting. A wild olive into a good olive, does not improve the wild olive; the fruit being similar to the cion engrafted, and not similar to the stalk. But the apostle's design was to shew that the Gentiles partook *equally* with the Jew, as the engrafted cion equally partakes with the natural branch, in the sap and vigor of the root.

The interpretation which accords with the facts I have stated, and also to the whole scope of the chapter, taken in connection with the whole of the sacred metaphors employed by the penmen of holy writ, is, I presume, the following: The good olive tree was the Jewish nation—the wild olive tree denoted the Gentile world—the root and fatness of the good olive tree was Jesus Christ; and in a still more enlarged and exalted sense, the Christian church is the good olive tree. The natural branches denote the Jews, and grafting expresses union by faith to Jesus Christ, the life giving root—partaking of the root and fatness, denotes their full enjoyment of all the special blessings that result from union with Christ. This interpretation of the metaphors that have been quoted by my opponent from this chapter, I have given, not merely with a view of refuting him, for I am acquainted with other representations of them that I have seen in controversies upon this subject, which would be, on first appearance, more plainly against his views. But these interpretations I considered forced and not according to the scope of scripture. I consider it a sad misfortune when sectaries will compel the scriptures to speak their views. I venture to say that very few Baptists have approached so nigh to the interpretations of the Pedo-baptists on this subject, as I have now done—and yet I am convinced, that it will appear that this interpretation of them, is both scriptural and decisive against the arguments of my opponent.

Some may object to my applying the same metaphor, “a good olive tree,” both to the Jewish state and the Christian church.—This is in no respect more incongruous, than that the Jews should be called “the people of God,” and that the Christians should be called “the people of God.” This only shews, that either in a different sense, or in a higher sense, the same words may be used. For instance, a man’s children, his lands, and his live stock, are called his property. Now it is obvious they are not all his property in the same sense: his children are his property by birth, his lands by inheritance, or by purchase, and his live stock by bequest or by purchase. But it is not from analogy, but from scripture authority, that I say the Jews and the Christians are in a different sense called the good olive tree.—My authority for so interpreting this passage, is, Jeremiah 11, 16, The Lord called thy name (the Jews) “a green olive tree, fair and of

goodly fruit"—and the Apostle reasons with a reference to this passage, when he speaks of the branches being broken off; for in the same verse the prophet saith, "with the noise of a great tumult he hath kindled fire upon it (the olive tree) and the branches of it are broken." The olive tree, an emblem of beauty, of excellence, and of profit, was a fit emblem of the Jewish state in its glorious days. It was their relation to the Messiah, natural and federal, that obtained for them all the beauty and excellence that rendered them worthy of so beautiful an emblem. Jesus Christ was their relative according to the flesh—was "made of the seed of David according to the flesh"—he was federally, or by covenant, connected with them—"In thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed," was the covenant confirmed before of God in Christ, 430 years previous to the law, and promised to Abraham—John tells us, "he came unto *his own*, (by nation) and *his own* received him not."

The natural and covenant relation that subsisted betwixt Christ and the Jews, was the source of all their beauty, of all their honor and glory. When they denied their own relative, kinsman, redeemer, their promised king and deliverer, *ichabod* was written upon them, "the glory is departed." Such of them, the remnant according to the election of grace, as received him, to them he gave power to *become the sons of God*. Whether Jews or Gentiles, they became "the sons and daughters of the Lord God Almighty." The connection now formed betwixt them and Christ was *not natural* but spiritual; not according to a *temporary*, but an *everlasting* covenant; so that they became the "good olive tree," in consequence of their spiritual and eternal relation to Christ, the life-giving root, from whom springs all beauty and excellence. Now branches from the wild olive were grafted into this root; the natural branches, the Jews, were broken off, and such of them as were not rejected, received something, of which they were before destitute, viz. a spiritual and inseparable connection with the root and fatness of the good olive—and in the same manner, as the engrafted Gentiles received nourishment therefrom, and *with them* partaking of the root and fatness.

"*Thou standest by faith*," is the sole cause of union to the good olive, and the only means of participation in its root and fatness, assigned by the Apostle; and at one

stroke cuts off the whole system which my opponent endeavors to prove from this chapter. Infants are excluded from any visible participation in this good olive, seeing that faith is required to any enjoyment of its root and fatness, and the only means of engrafting into it. In the Jewish state, they were naturally and in covenant connected with the Messiah, and derived their share of natural privilege from him—but their growth was natural, not engrafted. Now that engrafting is necessary, and faith the sole means of it, they are necessarily excluded from any visible connection with the church of Christ, or good olive tree; consequently all attempts to prove the New Testament similar to the Old, or the church of Christ similar to the Jewish state, must fail of any support from this portion of scripture, to which Mr. W. appealed with so much confidence of success.

[In addition to the above, which fully expresses the substance of all that I said on this passage during the debate, I will now add a testimony from Ezekiel the prophet, further corroborative of the views which I have now presented. It is from chap. 16, verses 60 & 61.—These two verses I will transcribe—"Nevertheless I will remember my covenant with thee in the days of thine youth, and I will establish unto thee an everlasting covenant. Then thou shalt remember thy ways and be ashamed, and thou shalt receive thy sisters, thine elder and thy younger; and I will give them unto thee for daughters, *but not by thy covenant.*" This prophecy foreshews the bringing in of the Gentiles, and the establishment of the everlasting covenant, with a remnant of the Jews and of the Gentiles. But what is peculiarly striking in relation to this subject, is, that these Gentiles were to become daughters or members of the church, *not by the covenant of the Jews*—contrary to my opponent, for he maintains by *the same covenant*. The Lord saith, "*not by thy covenant.*" This testimony speaks a volume against the Pede-baptists.]

But to return: Mr. W. in order to maintain his ground, and to shew that circumcision conferred spiritual blessings, again cites Rom. 4, 2—12. Here again I must take the liberty of stating that the Apostle's design in this chapter, and that of Mr. W. are very dissimilar. The Apostle's design was to shew, that a man is justified by faith, and that Abraham was justified by faith without circumcision, and partook of all that blessedness which

David described, independent of, and previous to, his circumcision. Mr. Walker's design is to shew that circumcision conveyed spiritual blessings. His design then, as I have before shewn, is not only dissimilar to the Apostle, but if Mr. W. can maintain his ground, he has completely confuted the Apostle. The Apostle reasoned to shew, that even Abraham received all spiritual blessings previous to circumcision; even that blessedness which David describeth as the lot of the righteous and happy. Mr. Walker reasons to shew that this was not the fact, but that Abraham did receive spiritual blessings in circumcision, which of course he did not previously possess. This conclusion must unavoidably follow every attempt to prove from the 4th to the Romans, that circumcision conveyed spiritual blessings. I wish that Mr. W. would for once choose such a portion of scripture, as will allow him to have the same design with the penman, or with the spirit that indited it. This he has not yet done, as far as I can recollect.

To balance accounts with the Baptists, he has asked what spiritual blessings did Baptism seal or convey to Simon Magus? I answer—none. But was Simon Magus a believer? No. Was not this the cause why he received no benefit from Baptism? Yes. Therefore infants can receive no benefit from baptism, because they cannot “believe in him of whom they never heard.” Simon Magus professed to believe, and therefore, as far as man could see, was a proper subject of baptism; at least Philip was justified in baptising him. The most that can be said of him as a candidate for baptism, is, that he was *professedly* but not *really* a proper subject of Baptism. The case of Simon Magus is a very convincing proof that none but proper subjects can receive the blessings resulting from obedience to any ordinance or commandment. But what would Mr. W. prove from this? Would he prove that Baptism is an empty ordinance to all believers, or to any? Surely not. Would he prove that we may be mistaken in the administration of it to some candidates? This needs no proof—we admit we cannot judge the heart—but on the same grounds that we would admit a candidate to the communion table, and on no other, would we baptise him. Or would he prove, that because we Baptists are *sometimes* mistaken in the receiving of candidates, that he may be *always* mistaken in

the character of the subjects to whom he administers it? I confess that his manner of proposing the question, though I hope contrary to his design, suggests that such is the meaning thereof.

In the last place, Mr. Walker tells us that infants may, if they are obedient to the divine law after they grow up, receive benefit from baptism. This is an honest, though I presume an unintentional confession, that they receive no benefit from it, either at the time of receiving it or immediately after: but if they be good sons and daughters, and keep the commandments, they may receive some benefit from their infant sprinkling. This, however, the best thing that could be said as to benefits communicated in infant sprinkling, is a novelty in ordinances and commandments. I never recollect to have heard of any thing ordained for the benefit of man, or any thing enjoined upon him, by divine authority, that had not some immediate advantage resulting to the subject who obeyed according to truth.—So my opponent has placed all the advantages of infant sprinkling upon a slippery *perhaps*—upon a wonder working *if*. I confess in this he has shewn great ingenuity, for it is better that they should rest upon an *if*, than upon nothing at all.

—But he has said that infants, in the act of baptism, are laid under an obligation to obedience—that the vows of God are upon them thenceforth.—Let me ask, how many years old are they when they recognize this obligation? Shall I say at 10 or 15 years after sprinkling—I presume not sooner; and I think they must have a curious mind, if ever they can persuade themselves, that they are under obligations, in consequence of any thing their parents did for them in sprinkling. I have only to ask, what sort of an obligation is that, under which a subject lives 10 or 15 years totally unconscious of it, and which, as virility, makes its appearance at a certain age?

Having now replied to every thing worthy of consideration, in the topics presented by Mr. W. I shall occupy the remaining minutes of my period in suggesting a few considerations, different from those hitherto introduced.

It has often been remarked, that all artificers have their own rules, by which they are regulated in their respective arts and callings. It is equally plain, that teachers of religion, who embrace different systems, have each

their own rules, in going to work to support their peculiar tenets. This is strikingly manifest in the Baptist and Pedeo-baptist mode of supporting their different views on the doctrine of Baptism. When an advocate for infant baptism begins to support his tenets, he leads you back to the days of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, 2000 years before the institution of Baptism. He tells you of the covenant of works and of the covenant of grace, and persuades you to consider that the old musty covenant of circumcision, is just the same as the new covenant of grace. He labors hard to explain the items of this old covenant, and to make you believe that they are just the same with those of the new. After having led you by the hand through a dark and intricate labyrinth, explaining allegories, types, and metaphors; sometimes unfolding mysteries, at other times creating mysteries which never before existed, he arrives at the borders of the New Testament times.—As soon as he enters the New Testament, he has to go back to the Old Testament to explain it; thereby shewing you that the Old is plainer than the New!—Telling you occasionally of Christ's blessing infants—of the promises given to them, and of the many households baptised. When he comes to any thing too hard for him to allegorize, mysticise or explain, he tells you it was a mistake of the translators, and should be rendered so and so. Sometimes he tells you of the poor, illiterate, misguided Baptists, who will not believe that *in* signifies *at*—that *much water* signifies a *few drops*—that *coming up out of the water* signifies just coming from the edge of it, and that *going down into the water*, means no more than going to the shore.

In the greatness of their erudition, these and many other things unintelligible to an *illiterate* Baptist, appear plain and easy. Thus they explain washing by sprinkling, and can, by profound learning, convince you that it is a matter of indifference whether you sprinkle or immerse, and that believers are the proper subjects, and that infants are also equally proper subjects; yet, if their system prevailed, there would not be a believer to baptise in the world; all the human family would be baptised, before one of them knew the right hand from the left.—How often does the poor old grey-headed hearer, after 40 or 50 years reading the Bible, exclaim, after hearing one of these deep and learned divines expounding some text,

What a fine thing learning is! I should have read the Bible all my days, before I could have thought that so much was comprehended in a few plain words! I should never have found that out had not my Pastor told me so! How little good would the Bible have done, had it not been for this best of gifts—the clergy!!!*

When a Baptist calls the attention of his hearers to this subject, he begins 2000 years nearer the commencement of Christian baptism: he begins, in his most remote introduction, with the ministry and baptism of John the Baptist, the harbinger of Christianity. You will sometimes hear him telling of all Judea and Jerusalem turning out to Jordan, to John, to be baptised of him. Perhaps he may ask such questions as the following: Did John require any thing of the candidates that appeared on the banks of the Jordan, but connection with Abraham? Did he look no farther than carnal descent? To these questions he will answer, *yes*. He will read you two or three passages of scripture, in which John calls upon them to repent, and to bring forth fruits meet for repentance, in order to baptism. He will detain you a little while at Enon, and at your departure he will ask you one easy question, viz. Why did John baptise at Enon? And you must answer, saying, "Because there was much water there." He will probably take you next to the Mount where the Redeemer gave to his apostles that commission to preach the Gospel, to make disciples, and to plant and water churches, under which they always acted. He will, in order to illustrate the Apostolic views of this commission, read you a considerable part of the actions and ministerial deeds of the Apostles. From all which he will exhibit their constant practice, viz. First, preaching the Gospel—secondly, baptising the converts or the believers only—next, adding them to a church, or forming one, if so many could be found in one place—and finally, exhorting them to continue constantly in the Apostle's doctrine, in breaking bread, in fellowship and in prayers. After he has expatiated more largely upon these topics, he will request you to attend to the doctrinal import of baptism, as expounded by those great and excellent men,

* It is far from my design to pronounce one sentence to undervalue true learning, or to underrate the truly learned teacher of Christianity;—it is those pedants and quacks in theology, (which, alas, have crowded into the pulpit) that I have in view.

and infallible expositors of the will of Heaven, viz. the venerable apostles Paul and Peter. Perhaps he may, in the end, entertain you with a statement of the advantages enjoyed by those who walk in the plain path of the Divine commandments; and conclude by exhibiting the unhappy end of those who wander after their own imaginations, and walk in the light of those sparks which they have kindled.—So labors the Pedit-baptist, and so labors the Anti-pedit-baptist, or the Baptist, in their respective vineyards. As I presume I have, for this time, nearly occupied the time allotted me, I will give place to my opponent.

Mr. Walker then proceeded—

You see Mr. C. wants to be off to the dipping work, but I'll keep to the subject; he has broken through the rules; he was to keep to the *subject*, but he has got to his favorite topic, the *mode*. Well, he'll not draw me after him—nor will I give up with my arguments. He may use his forty minutes as he pleases; he wants to draw me from the covenants—I see his design—but that everlasting covenant which Jeremiah speaks of, and Paul in his epistle to the Hebrews, is of too much importance to be given up with so easily. Why is it called an everlasting covenant, if it was to be done away? No, it is confirmed by an oath—by the oath of Him that cannot lie—by two immutable things, the promise and oath of the eternal God. Under this covenant the Jews lived; hence they were said to be married to the Lord; I am married unto you, saith the Lord. Heb. 6, 13, “For when God made promise unto Abraham, because he could swear by no greater he swore by himself, saying surely, blessing, I will bless thee, and multiplying, I will multiply thee, and so after he had patiently endured, he obtained the promise.” For men verily swear by the greater, and an oath for confirmation is to them an end of all strife; wherein God, willing more abundantly to shew unto the heirs of promise the immutability of his counsel, confirmed it by an oath. That by two immutable things, in which it was impossible for God to lie, we might have a strong consolation, who have fled for refuge, to lay hold upon the hope set before us.

This covenant was confirmed in the above manner to the heirs of promise, which are believers, and their chil-

dren, "For the promise is unto you and your children." Now the new covenant is, as I have before said, the same in substance with the old one; there may be a few new things, and yet the covenants be the same. [Here there was a repetition of the bond, and the 4th to the Romans was again brought forward, with the 11th, without the addition of one new idea, so that, unless I should transcribe the whole of what I have already recorded on these topics, I have nothing more to bring forward spoken at this time on these subjects.] That the Jewish nation, said Mr. Walker, was the church of Christ, appears obvious from what Stephen says in the 7th of the Acts, 38. "This is he that was in the church in the wilderness, with the angel that spoke to him in Mount Sinai, and with our fathers who received the lively oracles to give unto us." Here, then, the Jewish nation are called the church, and as they are so often called the *congregation of the Lord* in the Old Testament, there is no reason why we should refuse to call them the church of Christ, equally with any in the New Testament times—Besides, in the Song of Solomon, the Jews and their offspring are figuratively represented as the bride or church of Christ. Song 1, 8, "If thou knowest not, O thou fairest amongst women, go thy way forth by the footsteps of the flock, and feed thy kids beside the shepherd's tents"—here the church is called the fairest among women; and the shepherd's tents, may denote the congregations of the church in which we see the little kids or infants are to be fed: the Bridegroom says of his church, "My love, my undefiled is one," thereby shewing that the church of Christ was ever one and the same. I suppose, according to my opponent, there was no church in the world until the days of the Apostles. So that according to him the church of Christ never existed until about 1800 years ago. The Lord had no people in the world since the beginning till the Apostolic age, on his hypothesis. What then shall we make of the Apostle's account of the church, in the 11th chapter of his epistle to the Hebrews, where he summons a cloud of witnesses to show that from Abel to the present day, the faithful have ever been the same church, and possessed of the same faith? According to Mr. C. Moses, Enoch, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, were not members of the church; they had not any part in the church of Christ—Neither had David, Samuel, or the prophets,

any place amongst Christians. Strange views! Strange doctrine! That the world should pass on 4000 years without a church in it!—You see, my friends, rather than admit infant baptism, Mr. C. would destroy the church of Christ, or banish it from the Bible, till the time that he thought best suited his scheme. So far were the prophets from countenancing these views, that when Jeremiah speaks of Gospel times, he intimates that all these extensive blessings would be confirmed and secured to the house of Judah and to the house of Israel—"Behold the day is come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah." Taking into view what I have said on the 11th to the Romans, with these additional remarks, I am of opinion that no unprejudiced person can doubt but that the Christian church is the same as the Jewish.

Mr. C. has called this everlasting covenant "an old musty covenant;" this is a handsome way of speaking of the Divine covenant—of that precious covenant of grace, which the saints in all ages have venerated—to such extremes must they be driven who would deny infant Baptism. I see my opponent wants to proceed, "I'll let him loose again."

I replied as follows:

To assert a proposition and to declaim upon it is easy; but to prove a proposition that is not intuitively evident, requires close reasoning, and not pompous, loose declamation. I am sorry that Mr. W. should abound so much in assertion and declamation. To prove that the old covenant and the new are the same, he has quoted an epistle which he should never have mentioned for this purpose, that is, the epistle to the Hebrews: The Apostle, in the 8th chapter of this epistle, gives us what he calls "the sum" of all he had written in it. He begins by saying, "Now of the things which we have spoken this is the sum." [Here I read the whole chapter and commented on it. I shall not now transcribe the whole chapter nor the whole comment upon it, but such parts of it as are inseparably connected with the controversy. I would request the reader to refer to the whole chapter.] The "sum" of the Apostle's arguments was to prove, that the Aaronic Priesthood was an example or type of the Priesthood of Christ, and that Christ is the mediator of a *better cove.*

nant, established upon *better promises* than that which Moses mediated, than that given to the Jews—verses 6th & 7th, he says, “But now he hath obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also he is the mediator of a *better covenant* which was established upon *better promises*; for if that first covenant had been *faultless*, then should no place have been sought for the second.” On these words observe, the Apostle declares that the reason why a new and better covenant was given, was, because of some imperfection in the old one—If that first covenant had been *faultless*—Yet Mr. W. will tell you the new is just the same—if so, then it is *faulty*. Paul saith the new covenant is *better* than the old—Mr. W. says it is just the same; Paul says the new is established upon *better promises* than the old—Mr. W. says they are the same. When Mr. W. and the Apostle Paul, in their respective systems, are thus at variance, each of you may judge which of the two is the safest guide. Rather than give up with his infant sprinkling, Mr. W. will run into these awful extremes!!!

Let us hear the Apostle further—verses 8th and 9th, “For finding fault with them, he saith, Behold the day is come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Judah; not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt, because they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord.” Here the Apostle affirms that the Jews broke his covenant, and therefore the Lord proposed in future, that is in Gospel times, to make another—Mr. W. says to make the same—the Lord saith “Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers”—Mr. W. says, just according to the covenant he made with their fathers. Mr. W. some time ago said, the Lord regarded them as his people according to the covenant—The Lord saith, “I regarded them not.”

Now let us attend to the items of the new covenant—Verses 10th, 11th, & 12th, “For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel, after those days, (after the Jewish state passed away) saith the Lord. I will put my laws into their minds, and write them in their hearts; and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people. And they shall not teach every man his

neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, know the Lord, for they shall all know me, from the least to the greatest; for I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and iniquities will I remember no more."

This covenant differs from the old, in each of its four items: In the first, The laws were written on tables of stone, and as Moses brake the stones, so the people broke the laws. In the second or new, they are written on the hearts of all the subjects—consequently cannot be broken. This is one of those *better promises* on which the *better covenant* is established. Item 2d, "I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people. In the first, he was their God in a national and temporal sense—In the second he is their God in a spiritual and eternal sense—In the first, their being his people depended upon an *if*—In the second, they *shall* be, positively and without an *if*, his people—Item 3d, "They shall not need to teach every man, his neighbor, saying, know the Lord, for they shall all know me from the least to the greatest"—The subjects of the old covenant required to be taught to know the Lord; many of them were infants and minors and at best a carnal people—but the subjects of the new, are all taught of God—they know him from the least to the greatest; consequently *no infants are subjects of the new*. Item 4th, "I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their iniquities will I remember no more." No remission of sins, promised to the subjects of the old covenant, as such; but to the subjects of the new, as such, forgiveness is promised—Who will not say this is a *better covenant* established upon *better promises*? The last verse of this chapter confirms all that I have said on the abrogation and total disannulment of the old covenant. Oh! that every pedo-baptist would remember it: It should forever silence my opponent on these topics—It reads thus, "In that he saith a *new* covenant, he hath made the first *old*—Now THAT which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away."

As this chapter gives us the *sum* of the Apostle's reasoning in this epistle, the last verse of it presents to us the *end* or intention of his reasoning. It was to demonstrate that the old musty covenant was now "ready to vanish away." The word *now* is the most emphatic word in this verse—*formerly*, it was valid, substantial, obligatory upon its subjects; but *now*, in the commence-

ment of the Gospel age, it was *ready*, quite ready, fully ripe, completely fulfilled, necessarily tending to vanish away—"Vanish away"—how strong the expression! How figurative and how striking! No word could more fully express its entire, its total, its perpetual abolition. Mr. W. quarreled with my epithet *musty*; but here the Apostle amply justifies it—Yes, it was moth-eaten, 'decayed,' 'waxen old,' ready, as the shades of night, to vanish before the radiant sun of the morning. Let me ask, if, when any thing is decayed, waxen old, and ready to vanish away, is it everlasting in its nature—is it perpetually binding—does it yet flourish? My opponent must answer, *yes*, or give up his system. I tell you, my friends, this 8th chapter to the Hebrews cuts up the Pede-baptist system, and leaves it neither root nor branch. [In the Appendix, under the article "*the covenants*," this subject will be still further illustrated.]

Mr. W. has again attempted to identify the Jewish state and Christian church. He actually concedes, that, if this cannot be proven, his cause is lost. In this he closely follows the Goliath of Pede-baptists, the great Peter Edwards. Since Peter Edwards wrote, all the champions on his side take this ground; first prove, or attempt to prove, that the nation of Israel was the church of Christ—that infants were members of it—and then easily infer their right to baptism. In addition to his comment on the 11th chapter of Romans, he cites Stephen's testimony to sanction his views—Stephen uses the phrase, "the church in the wilderness"—Here the whole stress of his proof rests upon the word "*church*," without any epithet to qualify or explain its acceptation.—Now I will cheerfully admit the testimony of Stephen, in all its force; and I will call the congregation of Israel in the wilderness, a church: but will this prove that this congregation was a *church of Christ*? Mr. Walker, I presume, understands the word *church*, without an epithet, to mean neither more nor less than "an assembly"—I presume he will also confess, that a *mob* is once called a church in the New Testament. If he does not, I am ready to prove it—Acts 19th, we read of Demetrius, the silver-smith, and the mob which he raised against the Apostle and his companions: The whole town was in an uproar—the town clerk appeased this mob by an oration he delivered them, telling them that in a lawful '*church*,'

(eklesia, the same word used Acts 7, 38, the "eklesia" in the wilderness) their cause would be tried—and verse 41, when he had thus spoken, (apeluse ten eklesian) he dismissed the assembly or church. In this chapter, the word is applied to a mob, or an unlawful assembly, and it is also applied to a court, or lawful assembly, met to hear and judge causes. Thus the word eklesia, or church, was used by the holy penmen of the New Testament, to denote any sort of an assembly. Like the word synagogue, the epithet made it either an assembly of Jews or a "synagogue of Satan"—this criticism, I am confident, neither my opponent nor any man acquainted with Greek, will deny. Hence it follows, that his quotation from the 7th of the Acts proves nothing favorable to his views, inasmuch as it means no more than an assembly or congregation in the wilderness, without any respect to the character of it. It was an assembly or church of Jews, and not an assembly of Christians, or a church of Jesus Christ.

Seeing I am on the word "eklesia," I may further observe, that as this word is composed of two Greek words, *ek*, out of, and *kaleo*, to call, the word eklesia signifies "the called out." The Jews in the Wilderness were "called out" by Moses the messenger of God—the mob of Ephesus was "called out" by Demetrius; and the lawful assembly of which the town-clerk spoke, was an assembly "called out" by those in authority—the church of Jesus Christ is an assembly "called out" of the world by his grace, or separated from the world by his word and spirit—hence, says Christ, "ye are not of the world, I have chosen you *out of* the world." Consequently no nation, as such, ever was the church of Jesus Christ.

That the Jewish nation was never considered the church of Christ by the Apostles, is evident from many portions of scripture, particularly from Acts 2, 47, "And the Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved:" Query, was it to the Jewish nation, or the first church of Christ converted in Jerusalem, to which the Lord added such as should be saved? The answer to this question is inevitably against the Jewish nation, and incontestably plain, that the writer considered *not* the Jewish nation, but the believers in Christ, of that nation, the Church.

Let us now attend to the definitions and descriptions

we have in the New Testament of the church of Christ, and then we shall see how they will apply to the Jewish nation. Acts 20 & 28, we have an interesting description of it, in these words: "Feed the church of God, which he has purchased with his own blood." Here, in this description of the Christian church, we have every thing against my opponent's views—in the first place, the church of God is said to be purchased with his own blood—Could this be said of the Jewish nation, as such? Their redemption from Egyptian bondage, by blood, was a beautiful emblem of the redemption of the true Israel or church by the blood of Christ. Again, the members of the church are represented, in this description of it, as being capable of nourishment from the word by the labors of their pastors—"Feed the church of God"—"Feed my sheep"—"Feed my lambs"—How? "With the sincere milk of the word." Are infants capable of this? No; they cannot understand it. Amongst all the advices, exhortations, and commandments, given to the elders, bishops, or pastors of the churches of Christ, over which they presided, there is not one word which would insinuate, that they had any charge or care over the infants, or unbelieving children, of the members of the church;—these are private property; the property of the parents, and not the property of the church: hence parents, in their own capacity as such, have orders how to bring them up.

Open any of the Epistles, read any of the descriptions we have in the New Testament, of the Church of Christ, and we cannot find one hint that would suppose them to be assimilated to the Jewish commonwealth. [Here I read the introductions of several epistles, which all, in substance, agree with this mentioned below.] 1st Cor. 1, 2, "Unto the church of God which is at Corinth"—"to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus called saints, with all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, both theirs and ours." All the Epistles written by the Apostles to particular churches described those churches as composed of believers, sanctified persons—active members, fruit bearing branches, in the true and living vine. They were commanded to keep separate from all contaminating intercourse with the world; and in their communion and church intercourse to have no fellowship with unbelievers, with immoral or ungodly

persons, such as the majority of the Jewish nation ever was.

What absurd conclusions will result from the hypothesis, that the Jewish nation was the church of Christ? The church of Christ put their own Saviour to death!—Those Jews that were members of this hypothetical church, put the Messiah to death. Those Jews that made havoc of the church, were members of it!! Nay, those that repented, and were, in consequence, “added to it,” were members of it before they were added to it! These are a specimen of the consequences naturally and necessarily resulting from my opponent’s system.

He has expressed considerable surprize, that I should think there was no church of Christ in the world for so long a time; nay, that I will not admit that Samuel the prophet, David the king, Isaac and Jacob, were members of the church of Christ. Now, I may express my surprize at this strange objection. That these saints, and thousands not mentioned, belonged to the society registered in Heaven, that they were saints approved of God, I hesitate not to affirm; but does the acknowledgement of their saintship, require me to make them members of the church of Christ *formally* existing in the world? I had thought, all along, that we were deliberating on the visible or formal exhibition of the church on earth, or the Christian church—and not the “church invisible” in the language of my opponent. The least member of the Christian church, is greater, in consequence of his membership there, than the greatest saint or prophet from Adam to John the Baptist. When Paul sums up a long list of renowned saints, of faithful worthies; in the 11th of his Ep. to Heb. he proves their faith to be one and the same with that which Christians possessed—only that the great object of the faith of the patriarchs, was future to them, and that of Christians past. In the conclusion, he declares that these saints had not received the promise, “God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect.” I would wish to know to what church *formally* existing in the world, the patriarchs for 2500 years belonged? The world was 2500 years old before this Jewish church got into operation, of which Mr. W. so often speaks. Whatever be the name of that church, there is not one word said of the membership of its infants; and it was of the

longest continuance of any church that ever yet appeared—it continued from Adam to Moses, or at least from Adam to Abraham. No infant membership for this long space. The Jewish state only lasted from its erection into a nation, 1500 years; and had it not been necessary to the accomplishment of prophecy, and to identify the person of the Messiah, that the Jews should receive a mark in their flesh as soon as born, to keep them distinct from all the world; we should never have heard a word of infant membership. From a mistaken view of the intention of that mark in their flesh, and from a desire to return to “the weak and beggarly elements,” has this confused and untenable system of infant membership in the church of Christ, originated.

Mr. W. has cited the Song of Solomon, and from a figurative description of Christ’s love to his saints in general, and their love to him in particular, he would infer that the Jews were in the same spiritual connexion with Christ as Christians. Since he has merely quoted these verses, and not shewn how they apply to his views of the Jewish nation being a church of Christ, I will reserve my strictures on them ’till he make his meaning plain.

He argues from the phrase, “I am married unto you,” to shew the impossibility of their being ever disregarded as the people of God. But granting them, in the highest sense of the word, married to the Lord, it will not follow that they never could, in a figurative sense, be divorced—yea, they were accused of committing spiritual whoredom on many occasions, and, consequently, according to the analogy of the figures, liable to be divorced. Indeed they were said to be divorced, because of their spiritual adultery—see Jer. 3, 8: “And I saw, when for all the causes whereby backsliding Israel committed adultery, I had put her away, and given her a *bill of divorce*, yet her treacherous sister Judah feared not, but went and played the harlot also.” In process of time, both Judah and Israel, having broken the covenant, on account of which they were said to be married, were divorced, “they continued *not* in my covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord”—Heb. 8, 7th 8th. So that here, also, Mr. W. fails of proof for his identifying the Jews and Christians as one and the same church.

Having now replied to all that Mr. W. has advanced in support of his views. Having found all his arguments

destitute of scripture evidence; a few minutes yet remaining, I purpose to employ them upon a topic that should have, long ere now, come forward.

We have often heard that Divine Commandments or Ordinances have been correctly divided into two classes; by some called moral natural, and moral positive—by others, merely moral and positive. When these distinctions are explained in the following sense, (which we believe to be the true meaning of the distinction) we consider them scripturally correct. By moral positive, or positive, we understand those that depend entirely for their moral obligation, upon some express precept of the Deity; the propriety of which, nature, in its most perfect state, could not discover—The prohibition of the fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil; the appointment of sacrifice; of resting on the Sabbath or seventh day, were of this nature. Amongst the patriarchs and Jews, there were many institutions of this character. The whole construction, furniture, and service, of the tabernacle, and afterwards of the temple, were of this nature. That is, nature, in her most improved state, could not discover the propriety of these institutions. For instance, Adam in Eden, could not, by the exercise of any faculty he possessed, see any thing in the nature of the forbidden fruit, prohibiting him from the use of it, and rendering it sinful for him to touch it. The positive precept of the Almighty alone, rendered it a sin for him to eat it, and a duty for him to abstain from it. So of all other positive institutions, both in the Old Testament and the New. Moral precepts are such as respect our duty to our fellow creatures, and are, in some degree, more or less discernible by mankind even now, and were perfectly so previous to the fall, merely by the light of nature. Thus, for instance, Adam in paradise, without a law, knew that it was right to love his wife, to cherish and protect her as himself. And now, though fallen, men perceive such virtues as truth, honesty, and common justice, to be, in the nature of things, necessary and right. Though they may differ much in the extent and accuracy of their views on these topics, yet they must perceive, in some degree at least, that they are in themselves right. Of the heathen, the Apostle saith, “Their conscience bearing them witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another”—Rom. 2, 15.—

Now, in positive institutions, the obligation is altogether in the command, but in moral duties the obligation is not only in the command, but also in the nature of things. Hence it has been correctly said, the former are right because they are commanded, and the latter are commanded because they are right. In positive institutions, the Divine authority commanding, is that which the subject views in his obedience; in moral precepts he views, also, the rational and moral use and beauty of the duty commanded. In positive institutions, we are not authorized to reason what we should do, but implicitly to obey. "See, (said God to Moses,) that thou make all things according to the pattern shewed thee in the Mount."—Not whether it be rational or proper to do so, but, go, do it. In moral requirements, we are clearly shewn and commanded to perform certain duties, but left at liberty to reason, to ascertain in what these duties consist. A man is not to reason whether or not he should be honest or just, but to reason to know in what honesty and justice consist. Hence, the apostle Paul gives us general rules, which, by our own reason, we are to apply to particular occasions, such as Philip 4th, 8, "Finally, brethren, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report, if there be any virtue, if any praise, think on these things." Here we have very general rules, left to be filled up by our own reflection and reason.

Having now distinguished positive and moral institutions, I proceed to shew, that on no account whatsoever in positive requirements, are we to attempt to reason upon the expediency of the things enjoined, but implicitly to obey on all occasions. When Eve, the mother of us all, began to reason on the expediency of eating the forbidden fruit, she began to sin. She reasoned, that as the fruit of that tree was pleasant to the sight, and to be desired to make one wise, there could be no harm in eating of it—consequently she concluded to taste it. Of the incorrectness of her reasoning, and of her incapacity, even when in Eden, to draw a correct inference, when reasoning on a positive institution, we have, alas! a melancholy proof.

The ark of the covenant was given in charge to the Kohathites, with all its appurtenances—See Num. 3d, 30 and 31. Uzzah, 450 years afterwards, when conveying

this ark in a cart, either heedless or forgetful of the Divine command, though of another family, presumed to touch it. He reasoned thus: 'The Ark of the Lord is shaken in the cart; it may be broken; it is expedient that I take hold of it to preserve it.' What Pedo-baptist ever, on the subject of Baptism, reasoned better? But mark the consequence of Uzzah's sophistry, and of Uzzah's misguided zeal—2d Samuel, 6, 7, "And the anger of the Lord was kindled against Uzzah, and God smote him there for his error, and there he died by the Ark of the Lord." Hence, learn the danger of attempting to depart from positive institutions, through our reasoning or expediencies.

It was a positive commandment, that no strange fire or incense should be offered (Ex. 30, 9) upon the altar of incense. Naidab and Abihu (Levit. 10, 1) contrary to this commandment, from some reasoning on expediencies, offered strange fire thereon. The consequence was, fire from Heaven fell upon them and consumed them. These instances, from many that might be adduced, demonstrate the glaring impropriety of attempting to set aside, to alter or amend positive institutions by our own reason, and pronounce a loud caveat to all Pedo-baptists.

Now, as it is confessed by all Pedo-baptists as well as Baptists, that baptism is a positive institution; I ask, does not the baptism or the sprinkling of an infant require a positive command; and I call upon my opponent to shew, if there was ever a positive institution founded solely upon reason or inference—and if not, to shew a positive precept authorising the sprinkling of an infant. This should have been attended to sooner, for what avails all reasoning, if the subject is of such a nature as not to be established by reason. My opponent may proceed.

Of Mr. Walker's reply this is the sum:

Mr. C. has preached you a long sermon this time; I shall call your attention to what he has last said. He has given you a lecture on moral and positive institutions, to prevent you from reasoning on positive institutions. But how has he left moral duties? To be gathered by the exercise of reason!—This is a very lax system; you may conclude from it, that whatever you cannot reason yourselves into the belief of, is not a duty. But I maintain that moral duties are as positively enjoined as any other, and

as plainly manifest as any thing can be—Thou shalt not steal, is a positive command; as much so, as “be baptised every one of you.” This is antinomianism he has been teaching you. This will go down with many. If we have no other standard of morality than just what we think, we might as well have no Bible; a man may think it right to sell children from their parents, or wives from their husbands, and it’s all right. Well, I hope my opponent will not make many proselytes to his system of morality.

He has given you a long comment on Hebrews 8th.—Now I would be glad to know how a covenant that was everlasting could be abolished, as he has affirmed. Was not the covenant of circumcision an everlasting covenant, and being the same as the covenant of Grace, is it not everlasting? The Lord says, Gen. 17, 13, “And my covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant.” Now, as the scope of his reasoning, on this chapter, is to shew that this covenant was done away, it must be inconclusive, seeing it is contrary to the express word which entitles it to an everlasting covenant.

Mr. C. says the Jews were divorced; thereby making light of the marriage relation that subsisted betwixt the Lord and his ancient people, the Jews. I think his observations make too little of the marriage relation. If men are not allowed to put away their wives on every trifling account, would the Lord thus lightly, agreeable to the figure, divorce and forever cast away his people? Has not Christ been always represented as the same husband of the church? Has it ever had another husband? Has not the church been ever represented as one and the same bride? If, then, the husband has ever been the same, and the bride always the same, how can they be said to be divorced, in his sense of the term?

He has said that Moses’s throwing down the stones on which the law was written, and their being broken, was an emblem or type of the breaking of that covenant; but I say this was a type or emblem that the covenant of works was broken, and not of the covenant to which he refers. And the law being written again, on new tables, denoted the writing of the law anew on the hearts of the people of God.

This covenant to Abraham was confirmed by an oath; its spiritual blessings were secured to his seed. and, in

consequence of this, it never could be so broken as to authorise the Lord to utterly reject his people. My opponent has not paid much attention to the oath that confirmed this covenant to the seed of Abraham. Upon this was predicated the sermon which Peter preached to the Jews on the day of Pentecost; and that infants have a right, with their believing parents, to baptism and church membership, is obvious from the conclusion of this sermon: "Repent, and be baptised every one of you, for the promise is unto you and to *your children*, and to all that are afar off, even to as many as the Lord our God shall call." I must now ask my opponent, Are not children included in this promise? And if he should ask me what children, I must refer him to Gen. 17, 17, "I will be a God to thee and thy seed after thee." Now as seed and children are the same, this promise is one and the same, and secures baptism to the infants of believers. By the same rule, and to the same extent as the Jews circumcised, are we to baptise. If, then, we will allow the scriptures to interpret themselves, they make it manifest that infants are proper subjects of baptism, inasmuch as they are included in this promise, when Christian baptism was appointed.

That infants are members of the church, appears further obvious from these words of Christ, "Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of Heaven." By the kingdom of Heaven, we must understand either the Church of Christ on earth, or the kingdom of Heaven above: If we understand it of the church on earth, then doubtless infants are said to be members of it; and if we should suppose that the kingdom of Heaven, or the invisible church above, is meant, then they must be born of the spirit, and consequently fit subjects of baptism. View this text then as we may, it secures and authorises the baptism of infants.

How, then, the Baptists can oppose a practice so ancient and so well founded on scripture, is to me strange and unreasonable. We have nothing to say against their baptising, or their dipping of believers; we only contend that infants should not be excluded from this seal of the covenant, nor debarred from their place in the church, which their birth-right requires, and which we have shewn belongs to them, by the promise of him who cannot lie.

Mr. C. has asked me for a positive command, authori-

sing the baptism of infants. I ask him for a positive command for the institution of a church, which is as positive as the institution of Baptism.

That you may hear how my opponent will reply to these things, I sit down.

My reply was then to the following effect :

Mr. Walker, instead of answering the very pertinent question which I proposed him, relative to positive institutions, has occupied your attention with an impertinent declamation on moral duties, in which he has endeavored grossly to misrepresent my views of morality. This is rather an ungenerous way of retreating from a question, which must, if answered correctly, have overthrown all his reasoning to-day. He has labored industriously to convince you of the dangerous tendency of my remarks on moral institutions. He has asserted, that I have attempted to prove "that moral duties are to be gathered only by the exercise of reason." Nothing can be more unjust; no remark can be more contradictory to plain declaration, than this perversion of Mr. W. My words on this part of the subject, were, "that a man is not to reason whether he is to be just or honest; but he may reason to know in what justice and honesty consist. In moral requirement we are clearly commanded to be just and honest, but allowed to reflect and reason, to ascertain in what these virtues consist." The words of the Apostle, which I cited from Phil. 4, 8, comprehend every thing I meant by these remarks: "Finally, brethren, whatsoever things are just, &c. think on these things." To illustrate, still further, this distinction, I would observe, that a man conscious of, and influenced by, the Divine commandments, relative to moral duties—such, for example, as justice, honesty and truth, will, in order to practice these duties, have constantly to exercise his reason upon a thousand occurrences in the common transactions of human life. In his common conversation, in buying, selling, and, indeed, in all his business of this world, he must constantly bring his thoughts, words and deeds to some standard, by which his conscience must approve or disapprove his conduct. If there had been a certain sum of money commanded to be paid on all occasions, as the value of a pound, yard, or any other quantity of the articles of commerce, then, indeed, we should have no occa-

sion to reason on the subject of honesty or justice in our transactions with the world. But seeing this is not the case, we can neither be honest, just, &c. without daily employing our reason on *general principles*.

In positive institutions, all that we have to enquire after, is the meaning of the words of one *particular precept*, which, to an iota, we are bound to perform, in the manner in which it is commanded. I again propose the above question to Mr. W. which, if he dare not answer, let him be honest and confess it—let him not raise a false alarm that he may escape detection. The question is this—Was there ever a positive institution founded solely upon reasoning?—In the conclusion of his address, he answered this question by asking another, viz: he asked me for a positive institution for a church. I will cheerfully answer his question, hoping he may thereby be induced to answer mine: In the commission given, Matt. 28, at the close, to the Apostles, they were commanded to make disciples out of all nations, to baptise them, and then teach them to observe all things Christ had commanded them. In teaching them these observances, they gathered them into societies called churches, which the Apostles planted every where they labored.—Thus, for example, Acts 2, “They made disciples out of the Jewish nation, they baptised them, and that same day added them to the 120 already made, which they called the church at Jerusalem.” Here, then, is a positive institution of a church, with the authority for it.

After having expatiated on morality, he next replies to my reasoning on Heb. 8th, by asking, How could a covenant that is called everlasting, be done away? This is mere play upon the word *everlasting*. The term everlasting is often used as a relative term in the scriptures, and in the very chapter in which the covenant of circumcision is called an everlasting covenant in their flesh, we have this term so used; verse 8, And I will give thee the land of Canaan for an *everlasting possession*. Now it is obvious that the Jews have not ever since that time lived in the land of Canaan, nor do we expect that they were to have lived there to eternity; but so long as they continued in that covenant, were they to enjoy that land; nor could they have a covenant in their flesh, which would last longer than their flesh; so that, in the strict sense of the word, could that covenant be everlasting? It was,

however, to last forever, so long as the Jewish nation was kept a separate and distinct people. The word *everlasting* is most frequently used in this sense, when applied to any thing belonging to this world, or man's condition in it. Hence we read of the everlasting priesthood of Aaron, of the everlasting hills, &c.; this being all that my opponent has to object to my interpretation of that chapter, it plainly amounts to nothing at all. Hence I conclude that my reasoning on it is unanswerable.

He next returns to Heb. 6, and to the promise made to Abraham confirmed to his seed by an oath. He should know that the Apostle, in reasoning on the seed of Abraham, both in his epistle to the Gallatians and to the Hebrews, interprets this seed as not the carnal or fleshly seed of Abraham, the Jewish nation, but as his spiritual seed connected with the Messiah. "He saith not to *seeds*, as of many, but as of me, and *thy seed*, which is Christ." "The children of the promise," or true Christians, "*are accounted for the seed.*" "So we brethren, (Christians) as Isaac was, are *the children of promise*"—For "he is the father of all them that believe;" and, *if ye be Christ's*, then are ye *Abraham's seed*, and heirs according to the promise." There is no spiritual connection with Abraham, there is no new covenant relation to him, but through Christ. Our participation in, or enjoyment of, any spiritual blessedness promised to Abraham, as the father of the promised seed, depends upon an *if*—if ye be Christ's, not otherwise, can ye partake of the spiritual blessings promised to Abraham in that covenant, confirmed before of God in Christ, 430 years before the giving of the law. If there be, or if there can be, any proposition intuitively evident, which respects the Christian religion, it is this, viz: That no connection, no relationship of a fleshly nature, no birth, blood, or descent, no temporal privilege, in a word, that nothing but faith in Christ, communicates or secures spiritual blessings to mankind.—Grace is not hereditary. Nor can any one in Christendom, where the Bible circulates, be born nearer the kingdom of Heaven than another. If Mr. W. and other Pedobaptists would consider the Apostle's reasoning in the 3d and 4th chapters of the letter to the Gallatians, they would discover that Abraham had, and still has, a two-fold seed, "the children of the flesh," and the children of the promise.—That Ishmael was a type of the one, and

Isaac of the other—That to the fleshly seed, every blessing they enjoyed came by the flesh; and every blessing of a spiritual nature, to the children of promise, came by the spirit of grace: “To Abraham and his seed were the promises made; he saith not to his seeds, (that is the natural and the spiritual) but to thy seed, which is Christ.” Faith in Christ is the great medium of connection, and the only means of any spiritual blessedness or true felicity.

My opponent seems reluctant to admit that the Jews were divorced agreeable to his figure of marriage. He fears it is making light of the marriage relation. But this is of a piece with his fears for morality, when positive institutions were submitted to his consideration. As a nation, I have already shewn the Jews were married to the Lord, and, as a nation, he divorced them. He then formed a relation more close, and altogether spiritual, with a remnant of the Jews and a remnant of the Gentiles—which, as Christians, he espoused to himself. It is not true, that the bride is the same now that she ever was, any more than that it is not true that the Christian church is similar to the Jewish. I must refer him to the consideration of Jer. 3, 8.

I am glad that I have got my opponent brought on to the New Testament at last, to quote some of those favorite texts of his brethren. I was afraid that the sun would have set, before we should have heard of any thing but circumcision and the Abrahamic covenants. He has gravely told us, that Baptism was preached on the day of Pentecost, on the footing of the promise made by Abraham; this is going a little farther than some of his senior brethren have gone. In this view of Peter's preaching, on that memorable day, he comes to the point with great ease, and apparent triumph. But, alas! “every man's way seems right in his own eyes, until his neighbor cometh and searcheth him out.” The argument deduced from this chapter is the following: The infants of believers are to be baptised, because they are equally included in the promise that authorises the baptism of the parent. Mr. W. quotes the verse and views the context in a summary way; he cites it thus—“Be baptised—for the promise is unto you and your children.” As there is so much use made of this verse, in establishing infant sprinkling, I intend being the more explicit in exhibiting the true meaning of it.

The Pedeo-baptists, in quoting and commenting on this text, commit some very gross mistakes, as dishonorable to their talents as men, as to their divinity as Christians. In Indian file, they follow one another, very similar to their first leader: In the first instance, they uniformly, as far as I have had access to know, (and I, myself, when fighting under their banners, was similar to them) misinterpret this *promise*, of which the Apostle speaks.

To place this promise in the clearest light, we must view the context. Acts 1, 4, the Saviour of the world, Luke tells us, shewed himself alive after his passion, by many infallible proofs, and spoke with his Apostles forty days, of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God. In his last interview with them, Acts 1, 4, "he commanded them that they should not depart from Jerusalem, but wait for *the promise* of the father, which, saith he, ye have heard of me," referring to John, 15, 26. But when the comforter is come, whom I will send unto you, from *the Father*, even the spirit of truth which proceedeth from the father, he will testify of me. Among his last words, he promised that they would soon be endued with power from on high. The next chapter informs us of the immediate accomplishment of these *promises*. The day of Pentecost was fully come—a mighty noise heard—the city in an uproar—thousands assembling—visible appearances of the Spirit, in cloven tongues of fire—sitting on the heads of the Apostles—some enquiring the meaning of these things—others mocking. Peter explains it all, by citing the prophet Joel—and what did Joel say? He predicted this day, and this wondrous event. The word of the Lord, by Joel, was, v. 17, "I will pour out of my spirit upon all flesh, your sons and your daughters shall prophecy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams. And on my servants and on my handmaidens, I will pour out, in *those days* of my spirit, and they shall prophecy." It is enough to observe, that the apostle Peter explains and applies this *promise* of the spirit, to that very day and occasion. This testimony he confirms, from sundry quotations from the ancient prophets, and in verse 33, approaching the immediate context of the contested verse, Peter says—therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father *the promise of the Holy Ghost*, he hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear. Im-

mediately, while he yet spake, this same spirit working in their minds, compelled them forthwith to enquire what they should do to be saved? Peter's answer is, "Repent and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive *the gift of the Holy Ghost*. For *the promise* (of this gift) is unto you and your children, and to *all* that are afar off, even *as many* as the Lord our God *shall call*. From the beginning of the book to this verse, I have shewn that *the promise* spoken of, is *the gift of the Holy Spirit*. The particle *for*, which connects the 38th and 39th verses, being illative, and equivalent to *because*, shews, most plainly, that the words immediately preceding, depend for support or establishment, on those subsequent to the *for*. Now the words immediately preceding, are: "Ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost"—"For the promise of it," &c. Again, the 38th comprehends just two things—a command, and a promise. The command is—repent and be baptised for the remission of sins. The promise is—and ye shall receive the gift, &c. Now the 39th verse is to establish the promise, to shew the grounds on which it was given. So that no man acquainted with language, no man who understands even the first principles of grammar, whose mind is not infatuated with a system repugnant to reason as well as scripture, could hesitate for a moment, in suspense, as to the meaning of *the promise*.

But again, when we, with the Apostle, turn over to *the promise* to Joel, from whom he quotes it; we discover that the 39th verse is merely a repetition of Joel's words, Joel 2, 28—32. "I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh, your sons and your daughters shall prophecy"—For, saith Peter, "the promise is unto you, and your children"—"*all flesh*"—"your sons and your daughters"—or "your children." Says Joel, 32d verse, and "in the remnant whom the Lord shall call"—says Peter, "to them afar off"—"even as many as the Lord shall call." No portion of Old Testament scripture, ever was more clearly identified with its corresponding portion in the New, or with its New Testament citation, than these verses of Joel are with those mentioned, Acts 2d. And he that saith he cannot see it, is blind indeed.

I have now unanswerably shewn the fallacy, that Mr. W. has been endeavoring to impose on you, in attempt-

ing to persuade you that *this promise* was the promise to Abraham, Gen. 17—or “the promise of Baptism.” More easily and more rationally could the doctrine of Purgatory be proven, than his assumption. It is without foundation and without precedent, save in the system of Pedobaptists.

But, moreover, Mr. W. has imposed a very convenient gloss on the words—“to your children.” If you will hearken to him, these were their little infants—new born babes. But as Joel and Peter both explain these words, as many of you who would prefer the prophet Joel and the apostle Peter, as expositors of the will of Heaven, may know, that these children were their sons and daughters, gifted with the spirit of prophecy. Joel’s words are: “your sons and your daughters shall prophecy, your old men shall dream dreams, *your young men* shall see visions.” Young men and young women were, in those days, esteemed children, as much as new born babes; but, now-a-days, it seems that young men and young women are no longer children than until they are weaned. Peter makes it even more plain than Joel—“to your children—to them also that are afar off—even to *as many* as the Lord our God *shall call*.” The promise, then, is to *the called* only—whether far off, or near—whether parents or children—whether young or old—whether infants or adults. *The called*, cannot mean those whom every preacher invites to baptism, but those whom the Lord calls by his grace or spirit. In this sense it is used, when *calling* is esteemed a blessing—“whom he called, them he also justified.”

Now when the whole passage is viewed from first to last, its interpretation is easy and obvious to all, and every way hostile to Mr. Walker’s cause. It is every way contradictory to that gloss, which exhibits the promise as the old promise, Gen. 17, or as baptism, and children as infants. I flatter myself, that my opponent will never again presume to accommodate this passage to his system: It is blindfolding the ignorant, and leading them by the hand far from the will of Heaven, in the mazes and labyrinths of purblind human invention.

The next passage from the New Testament, which Mr. W. brings in support of the cause he espouses, is, the words of the Saviour spoken to the Apostles, concerning their interference with some persons, who were bringing

their children or infants to him to be *blessed*. This verse has been often pressed into the service of their cause: "Suffer little children to come unto me and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of God." Unfortunately, this was spoken before Christian baptism was instituted. This difficulty is, by the advocates of infant baptism, easily surmounted. Some of them view it as spoken in the spirit of prophecy; and consequently easily apply it: Others pay no attention to this circumstance, but explain it as if written after the institution of Christian Baptism. There is another misfortune attending it, as respects their cause—that it was not baptism but a *blessing* these parents solicited for their children; but as these words both begin with a *B*, it makes but little difference with them; either baptism or a blessing will suit their system. A third, and still greater misfortune attends it—it proves too much for their system, at least for Protestant Pedo-baptists; the Catholic Pedo-baptist can very logically prove infant communion from it. The Catholic syllogism runs thus:

All members of the church, or such as are of the kingdom of God, have a right to communion or the sacrament of the supper—

But infants, saith Christ, are members of the church or of the kingdom of God:

Ergo—Infants have a right to partake of the sacrament of the supper.

The Protestant Pedo-baptist syllogism is precisely the same, only supply the word *baptism*—it runs thus:

All members of the church, or such as are of the kingdom of God, have a right to baptism—

But, infants are said by Christ to be of the kingdom of Heaven—or members of the church:

Ergo—Infants have a right to baptism.

I say, the misfortune is, that this text proves too much on their way of reasoning. Logicians say, what proves too much, proves nothing. The catholics not only reason according to the above syllogism, but, like their pedo-baptist brethren, they practice what they can so ingeniously prove. Hence they tell their infants, as soon as they can understand them, (and before they can understand them, they do it for them) to open their mouths and put out their tongues to receive the wafer, their Saviour's body, and then to swallow it whole, for it is *his*

body. They prove this by circumcision too—for, as baptism came in room of circumcision, and the supper in room of the passover, and as every circumcised person was to eat the passover, so every baptised person must eat the supper. Mr. W. follows their mode of reasoning precisely, in some respects, but they are more consistent than he. They follow their own reasoning to its proper extent, but Mr. W. stops in the midst and turns round and quarrels with the man who follows his system farther than himself. There remains yet another embarrassment on Mr. W.'s views of this text. He has said that the kingdom of God here spoken of, is either the church on earth or that in Heaven; and from either hypothesis he infers infant membership and baptism—but before these children came into the arms of Christ, he pronounced them, according to my opponent's view of the text, as members of either the church below or that above; consequently they had no need of baptism; for, according to him, baptism is the door of admission into the church. They were in it already. The legs of the lame are not equal.

As we have seen that this occurrence took place before the institution of baptism, that these children were brought for Christ's blessing, by imposition of hands, and not for baptism; that infant communion can be as fairly supported from it as infant baptism, it does not, it cannot, make any thing for the cause of infant baptism.

What then, shall we make of it? I answer just what it plainly says, viz: That some persons, having confidence in the Messiah, either as a prophet equal or superior to the ancients, according to the old custom, brought children to him to receive his benediction, and to receive the imposition of his hands.—The Apostles, supposing that they were too intrusive, forbade them. Christ invited them to be brought to himself (not into his church) and rebuked the disciples with this argument, "*of such is the Kingdom of Heaven.*"—The "*of such*" is the phrase on which the stress rests—and it simply expresses *similarity*—or, as the French read it, "*Car le Royaume des cieux est pour ceux qui leur ressemblent*"—"For the Kingdom of Heaven is *of such as resemble them.*" The humility, meekness, docility, and comparative innocence of children, are such as the Christian must ever imitate, for, except a man be converted, and become

as a little child, he shall not enter the Kingdom of Heaven.—This is the doctrinal use that our Lord makes of it; and as often as children, little children, are spoken of by him, in the New Testament, it is for some similar purpose.

The antiquity of infant baptism, is far from the weakest argument by which it has been supported. My opponent lays peculiar stress on the antiquity of the practice for which he contends, and seems fond of referring to Ecclesiastical History, as furnishing strong evidence in his favor. To it we have no objection to appeal—we find ourselves able to shew from the best sources of ecclesiastical antiquity, that the practice of Infant Sprinkling, or even of infant baptism, was commenced many years after the Apostolic age.

[Here I read some fragments of ecclesiastical history; but as the argument, from that source, was fully discussed on the second day of the debate, I postpone the insertion of them until I come to that time in which this subject was fully investigated.]

Mr. W. in his last reply, observed, that the breaking of the two tables by Moses, was not a type or emblem of the breaking of that covenant or laws, but an emblem of the breaking of the covenant of works. This appears a novel idea on the subject of the Jewish emblems. I have always understood, that every thing in the Jewish state, that was emblematical, was emblematical of the future, not of the past time. Commemorative institutions had a retrospective view to past events, such as the passover; yet they were emblematical of future events—but the breaking of the two tables, was not commemorative of the past, but emblematical of the future. These two tables were never, in scripture, called the Covenant of Works, but are expressly called the two tables of that covenant made with Israel, according to the flesh, Heb. 9, 4. Paul, speaking of the first covenant, or the covenant made with all Israel, and the tabernacle with its furniture, says, that in the “holiest of all,” in the ark of the covenant of the Jews, were deposited “*the two tables of the covenant.*” No language could more precisely identify the two tables of the law with the covenant made with Israel, than these words—yet the apostle Paul, in this, only follows the language of Moses, Deut. 9, 9. “When I was gone up into the Mount, to receive the tables of stone, even the

tables of the covenant which the Lord made with you." Is it not strange, that Mr. W. is so biassed and warped by an irrational and unscriptural system, as to make assertions as opposite to the plain and express word of God, as the East is opposite to the West. In discussing the subject thus far, he has failed to support any one thesis which he assumed, by any testimony from the oracles of Heaven—But that he may have another trial, I give place to him.

[Here the first day drawing to a close, we spoke once or twice each, in a great measure repeating over the substance of what had been said. I shall, therefore, now bring forward any things new, or not fully discussed before, which Mr. W. delivered in the two last times he spoke, and afterwards collect any thing new in my replies to them—and present it all together; and so conclude the first day's work.]

Mr. W. after having gone back to the 11th to the Romans, and having again repeated his comment on that Chapter, proceeded to shew that in the first 2500 years of the world, the period before the erection of the Jewish nation upon their covenant into a peculiar nation; that infants were accounted members of the church; that Seth the son of Eve, was born in the place of Abel, whom Cain slew; consequently was a member of the church in lieu of Abel.—Mr. W. then proceeded to shew that infants were holy. He cited 1 Cor. 7, 14, "the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by her husband, else were your children unclean, but now are they holy." It is obvious, said he, that the children of believers are in some sense *holy* by virtue of their parent's faith.—Now what is this holiness which results from the parent's faith?—It is not *real* but *federal* holiness; it is a holiness resulting from their covenant relation, or from the covenant relation of their parents. It is such a holiness as the Jewish nation possessed, an holiness proceeding from their covenant relation to God, on the footing of the Abrahamic Covenant.—This verse, continued he, may be rendered so as to justify this interpretation of it. It may be rendered in, or to, the believing party as correctly as to say *by* them. If, then, the infants of a believing parent are federally holy, or by covenant holy as the Jews were, they should be

baptized, for it was on account of federal holiness the Jewish infants were circumcised.

The above is the substance of any thing new that was advanced in addition to the repetitions already mentioned.

To these items I briefly replied: Mr. W. has, by his ingenuity, found an infant in the first 2500 years of the world, which he can easily bring into the church. This is Seth, who was born after the martyrdom of Abel. What a pity that Mr. W. could not find some few more infants, or even another to put along with Seth into the church, that existed in the days of Cain and Abel!!! How extremely fond is Mr. W. to find infant membership in the Bible, and in what a sad plight was he when in 2500 years of the world he could not find a companion for Seth. His witty come off on this occasion, deserves rather a laugh than a reply.

He next adduces federal holiness as a ground or reason for the administration of baptism to infants. What a labor would it have saved, had he brought forward one express command or precedent for the administration of sprinkling an infant. He argues, from 1 Cor. 7, 14, that as infants are called holy in some sense, they should be baptised. This syllogism stands thus:

All holy persons have a right to baptism—

But infants are holy persons—

Therefore infants have a right to baptism.

Now hear the Catholic Pede-Baptist:

All holy persons have a right to eat the Lord's supper—

But infants are holy persons—

Therefore infants have a right to eat the Lord's supper.

Can you, my friends, discover any difference betwixt Mr. Walker's and the priest's argument? I can assure you, that I am too dull to discover the thousandth part of a difference between them. But they are both sophistical: to expose their sophistry, I must give you another syllogism.

All persons *really* holy have a right to baptism:

But infants are *federally* holy—

Therefore infants have a right to baptism.

In this syllogism, the *middle term* is taken twice particularly, consequently there are four terms in the syllo-

gism, which converts it into a sophism of the first magnitude. It is the same in effect as if I should say :

All persons *really* holy have a right to baptism—

But infants are *not* really holy,

Therefore infants have a right to baptism.

This is a contradiction in terms.

But should Mr. W. contend that all persons that are *federally* holy have a right to baptism, then the argument stands thus—

All persons *federally* holy have a right to baptism :

But the whole Jewish nation was *federally* holy—

Therefore the whole Jewish nation had a right to baptism.

This proves too much for his system—consequently no argument can be drawn, in favor of infant baptism, from this passage.

But to expose the fallacy of his reasoning still further, let it be observed, that infant baptism was not the subject of inquiry on which the Apostle reasons ; but, may those Christians who have unbelieving partners, retain them in the married relation ? This was Paul's subject of investigation. Mr. W.'s is, may infants be baptised ? He quotes the Apostle contrary to his design : the Apostle told them that they might retain them, provided they were willing to stay with them. This he proves, by shewing that the unbelieving party was sanctified to, in, or by, the believing party, and that the children born in this connection were lawful or holy—whereas, should they separate, the children would, according to the marriage covenant, be unclean or unlawful. Paul, elsewhere, in one of his epistles to Timothy, uses the word *sanctify*, which is synonymous with make holy, in this sense—“ Every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused if it be received with thanksgiving, for it is *sanctified* (i. e. made lawful) by the word of God (authorising the use of it) and by prayer. Marriage is spoken of, in the scriptures, as a covenant relation between the parties—Mal. 2, 14, “ She is thy companion and the wife of *thy* covenant.” There is, then, an holiness or a legitimacy in this relation—there is also an uncleanness or unlawfulness in any departure from it. “ Marriage is honorable in all,” consequently lawful, “ and the bed *undefiled*.” The character of the parties in this relation affects, and has ever affected, their progeny. Children are either

clean or unclean, defiled or undefiled, holy or unholy, lawful or unlawful, according to the conduct or character of their parents with regard to this relation.

The most consistent solution of this passage is, that the Corinthians had a scrupulosity, in retaining their unbelieving companions, on account of the manifest disapprobation shewn by the Almighty in the Old and New Testaments, against them who had intermarried with those of no religion, or of a false religion. Particularly in the time of Ezra, it was ordered that those who had married strange wives should put them away with their children as being unholy or unlawful. If we should suppose, with the Pedo-baptists, that this holiness or sanctity entitled children to church membership, and consequently to baptism, then the unbelieving husbands or wives are members also, for they are said to be sanctified or made holy in the same manner as the children; nay, their holiness is the *root* from which springs that of the children. The holiness of the children depends upon the sanctification of the parties, their parents;—so that, if infants should be baptised on this account, so ought their unbelieving fathers and mothers—As is the root, so is the fruit. This text, then, viewed in whatever light it can consistently be placed, either proves too much or too little for Mr. W. To evade the force of this conclusion some have said, the unbelieving wife is only sanctified to the husband, but the little infants are sanctified to the Lord. They might, with as much evidence, have said, the little children may be baptised, and eat the Lord's supper, and the unbelieving mother sanctified to her husband, may be baptised, but must not commune with the church.

[After these things, there was a repetition of former replies to such things as Mr. W. had repeated, from Rom. 11—moral and positive institutions—the Covenants—the Promises. But as there was nothing new on either side, I consider it unnecessary to transcribe them again. So stood the controversy at the end of the first day. An adjournment was agreed on till Tuesday at nine o'clock, A. M.]

On *Tuesday Morning*, at the hour appointed, after Prayer, Mr. Walker thus began :

My Friends—I just proceed as if we had never moved from this ground since my opponent last spoke. I proceed as if I had not since slept, and will prosecute the subject just as we left it. My opponent has endeavored to lead, to coax, and to drive me from the Abrahamic Covenant, but I will not give it up. It is the main pillar on which I stand, and I will not relinquish it. My opponent feels the force of it against his system, and would gladly shrink from it. But from day to day, we shall, according to agreement, prorogue, rather than the subject should be left undecided. I hope my opponent will keep more closely to the subject this day than yesterday, and not roam at such random. Towards the close of yesterday, Mr. C. insisted on positive institutions, and solicited an express warrant for infant baptism.—Now, if I prove that the church of Christ received its origin in the Abrahamic Covenant, and that its institutions are the same with those instituted in that covenant, then this express warrant will be easily given. But I might ask him for an express warrant for female communion, and for praying in those places where he preaches. I believe that no express warrant, or no warrant more express, can be given for these things, than for infant baptism. And if my opponent can advocate female communion, can pray where he preaches—he might also baptize infants ; for the authority is, in my opinion, the same. But that there is a positive institution for infant baptism in the Abrahamic Covenant, I am convinced must appear to the unprejudiced.

If the ordinance of infant membership was instituted under the Abrahamic covenant, as it doubtless was, and if the Church of Christ is founded upon the same covenant, as it certainly is, then the membership of infants in it is a positive institution. And the command to circumcise infants, which was published under that covenant, is tantamount to the command of baptism, and includes the baptism of infants as well as adults. Paul, in his epistle to the Romans, 4 chap. shews us, that the greatest blessings of the Gospel were sealed to the Patriarchs by circumcision, and, consequently, it is equivalent to baptism, which seals spiritual blessings. Mr. C. has objected to my system, on the ground that circumcision did not seal spiritual blessings to all the circumcised. He has

gone on to shew that what circumcision was to one of Abraham's seed, it was to all of them.—Now, he declares that circumcision sealed only temporal blessings, and that among these temporal blessings an inheritance in the land of Canaan was one. I would ask, then, did circumcision secure to Ishmael an inheritance in the land of Canaan? If it did not, then he must admit that circumcision was not the same to all Abraham's seed, and consequently it might, on my principles, seal spiritual blessings to some, and not to all—concerning Esau, and his descendants the Edomites, I might also enquire what interest circumcision secured to them in the land of Canaan? Did not the Lord say that he had given Mount Seir for a possession to the Edomites? Now it is certain that Esau, as well as Jacob, was circumcised, and according to him, had a right guaranteed to an inheritance in Canaan.

That the kingdom of God is the same now as formerly, and that the Jews were that kingdom in as high a sense as the Christians are, appears very obvious from the words of the prophet Isaiah, 65 chap. 23 v.: "They shall not labour in vain, nor bring forth for trouble—for they are the seed of the blessed of the Lord, and their offspring with them."—From these words, it appears, that their offspring was, equally with themselves, the blessed of the Lord, and entitled to all the privileges of their parents.—This is further obvious from the 127th Psalm—in which children are called "*the heritage of the Lord, and the womb's fruit his reward.*"—If, then, infants are called by the spirit, "*the heritage of the Lord,*" is it not evident that they belong to his kingdom, and are entitled to the privileges of it?—Something more than temporal privileges is, doubtless, implied in this phraseology. Could there be any thing more flattering said of parents than to call them "*the heritage of the Lord—the blessed of the Lord?*" Now how are children said to be his heritage, without a seal identifying them as such?—Indeed, many things are said in the Old Testament that suggest the peculiar relation in which children stand to the Lord, particularly the offspring of the faithful. To deprive them, then, of the seal of the covenant, is, no doubt, an act of great injustice, which the baptists must answer for; in this respect they withstand God.—He who is their king, who is the Lord of Hosts, hath conferred upon infants this privilege, and they, from a mistaken zeal and a self-righteous principle, debar them

from the enjoyment of their privilege.—Christ says, “who-soever receiveth one such little child, receiveth me;” and if he has received them, why should not we?—If to receive them be to receive him, to reject them is to reject him. If the Lord has distinguished infants, and marked them out as worthy of our notice, and if he reproved his disciples for refusing infants when brought to him, assuredly we have good right to receive and baptize them.

Again—how many households do we read of in the Acts of the Apostles, that were baptized on the faith and conversion of the head of the house? There was the house of Lydia, the jailor’s house: the house of Cornelius, and the household of Stephanas—Can we suppose that there were no infants in any of these households? All the individuals that composed them, were baptized when the father or head of the house professed faith, consequently they were baptized on the faith of the parents. If any person will carefully read the accounts of the baptism of these households, he must be convinced that the members of them were baptised *on the faith* of the parents, or in consequence of their conversion of the parents.

This is quite analagous to circumcision, and, plainly shews that, as the infants were circumcised on the faith of the parent, or rather the federal holiness of the parent, so, in baptism, respect is had to the character of the parent, and we find that on the faith of the Jailor, all his household was baptized; on the faith of Cornelius, Lydia, and Stephanas, were their respective households baptized.

When we consider the respect shewn to infants by our Saviour; when we consider the promises given them, when we consider the covenant made with Abraham, the nature of the Jewish Church, the households baptized, and above all, the similarity between the dispensations of the covenant of grace under the Old and New Testaments, we cannot, we dare not, refuse infants the seal of that covenant to which they have been so long entitled, and from which none but the baptists debar them. I will now give place to Mr. C. hoping that he will not wander off from the subject—that he will keep to these covenants and no more attempt to draw me after him until they are fully discussed.

I then proceeded :

I am a little astonished why Mr. W. should again bring forward those topics that were so obviously discussed, and, in as far as his arguments were considered, evidently refuted yesterday.—This method tends only to protract time, to weary out the patience of those who are anxiously waiting for something interesting, and not for dull, stale repetitions, that neither convince nor edify. It appears that Mr. Walker is resolved to hold fast his views of the covenants whether or not, and to rest his cause solely upon them.—But what is still more surprizing, he continues to insinuate that I fear that ground—that I wish to get off from the discussion of it, as if he had yet adduced one argument that is not, in what I have already said, clearly refuted.—But if he has any thing new to offer, I would wish to hear it, as I am quite tired of refuting unmeaning repetitions.—I am, however, resolved to keep him as closely to these covenants as he can wish, and shall now attend to them until he is satisfied to give them up or to abandon this part of the subject.

As it is more than probable I may one day publish this debate, and as there were sundry things suggested yesterday, that, upon reviewing my notes, I am apprehensive, will not, when in print, be admitted by some pedit-baptists; and least I might be impeached with misrepresentation by some here present this day, I wish, in order to apprise Mr. Walker of my intention, and to prevent any misunderstanding, to read over, in writing, some of those theses which Mr. Walker yesterday assumed. I only wish to have Mr. W's assent to them as correct, and if they are incorrectly stated, I beg leave now to have them corrected. I request the gentlemen here taking notes, to enter, verbatim, the following propositions and questions which I am now about to propose to Mr. Walker, with such answers as may be given to them. I would also inform Mr. Walker, that I demand no privilege from him that I am not willing to grant to himself—he may propose to me any thesis or any questions he thinks necessary to ascertain my views, and I will give such answers to them, as I will not hereafter retract; I will abide by all the consequences resulting from the answers I shall give, and I entreat Mr. W. to do the same.—These things premised, I proceed to read two propositions, which I conceive to be the substance of much of what Mr. W. said yesterday, and

which are here written in nearly the same words which Mr. Walker himself used:—

Proposition 1st—"That the Covenant of Circumcision is the same with the New Covenant or Covenant of Grace."—Does Mr. W. admit and maintain this proposition? Mr. W. answers "Yes."

Prop. 2d—"That the Old and New Testament Church, are the same, with only some accidental or circumstantial differences."—Does Mr. W. admit and maintain this proposition? Mr. W. answers "Yes."

In order, then, still further to obtain Mr. W's views on these and some other topics, I proceed to ask Mr. W. a few questions, which I request him to answer, when he next speaks. I presume we shall be most likely, in this way, to get through the subject to-day; and if this method be not adopted, it may continue for weeks.

The questions which I shall propose at this time are three.* On the first proposition, *viz.* that the Covenant of Circumcision and the Covenant of Grace or New Covenant, are the same, I ask:

* The intelligent reader will no doubt perceive, that my intention in proposing the above propositions and questions, was, to bring the controversy on the Covenants to a speedy and satisfactory close; and with a reference to publication, to obtain from Mr. W. a record of his views and arguments, that would establish the truth of my statements, and prevent the impeachment, which is too common in such controversies, of misrepresenting the views or arguments of my opponent. It very fortunately had the desired effect, for no longer did Mr. Walker insinuate that I wished to avoid the controversy on the Covenants; and when the discussion of them ceased, it ceased at the request of Mr. W. or of his abettor and second, Mr. Findlay, to which Mr. W. *heartily* consented. Moreover, it places my feet upon a rock, in as much as it establishes the truth of the narrative of the first day's debate, and fully confirms the whole representation I have given of the means employed by Mr. W. to maintain his cause.

It was my design to have in the course of the debate, brought into one view the answers which Mr. W. gave to those questions, and to have exposed the tendency and discrepancy of them in relation to one another, and to the scriptures; but a proposition from Mr. Findlay to dismiss this part of the subject rather sooner than I had anticipated, prevented me from reviewing them in this way. This then I must reserve for the appendix, in which I propose briefly to compare and contrast them.—In the mean time the questions and the answers, in the words in which they were proposed and answered, shall be recorded, with the criticisms or observations that were pronounced upon them.

1st. Are they the same, in respect of the nature and extent of the privileges secured to the respective subjects, under each of those covenants ?

2d. Are they the same in respect of the interesting or entitling condition ; that is, is the ground of interest and of claim the same in both ?

3d. Is the condition of the continued enjoyment of the covenanted blessings the same in both Covenants ?

Having proposed these questions to Mr. W. I would next observe, that I do not intend to digress from the Covenants, even so far as to repeat my answers already given to those stale repetitions which he has just now pronounced. There are but two or three things mentioned in this morning's address, that I shall at all notice—The first of these is his answer to the question I proposed to him, at least four times yesterday, without receiving a reply. It was this, "was there ever a positive ordinance or institution founded solely upon inference or reason." Or can there be a positive institution without a positive precept or precedent authorising it ?—This question he has, after the deliberations of last night, answered by proposing another which he presumes equally operates against my views. The questions he proposes are—Where is my positive authority for praying where I preach, and where is my express authority for admitting women to the Lord's table ?—Now the intention of these queries is to shew that I am wrong, upon these principles, for doing so ; consequently he may be wrong too. Or he may establish his practice upon the strength of inferential reasoning, if I admit that I practice those things upon the footing of mere inference.—But I deny that either of these cases is parallel to infant baptism—or that either of them depend upon mere reasoning or scripture premises for their establishment. As to this difficulty with respect to prayer, I have only to quote one express precept of the Apostle, and his objection vanishes as a vision of the night—"I will, therefore, that men pray *every where*, lifting up holy hands without wrath or doubting." 1 Tim. 2d 8th. Now, if Mr. W. will shew us that where a man preaches is *no where*, then we have no scriptural authority for accompanying preaching with prayer ; but, until then, we suppose the command to pray *every where*, express authority for praying any where. As to his second query, concerning female communion, I have to observe that although sun-

dry pedo-baptists have made a salvo to soothe their minds, of this apparent difficulty, it is a poor and a pitiful come off—It is the most puerile and childish retort that I ever heard used by adults that had any knowledge of words and things.

Was the Lord's supper instituted or appointed to men or women as such? Was it not appointed to the disciples of Christ? "He gave it to his disciples, saying, partake ye *all* of it"—Here, then, is an express warrant for all disciples to participate of the Lord's supper. Now it puts Mr. Walker and all Pedo-baptists that humble themselves to such means to support their cause, to prove or to shew, that a woman is not a disciple of Christ.—But, should they attempt this, I have express authority to shew that they oppose the oracles of Heaven, for a woman is expressly called a disciple, Acts 9, 36, "For there was a certain *disciple* there named *Tabitha*;" so that these obstacles thrown in my way, are but means to afford a clearer and fuller illustration and confirmation of the truth of my reasoning on positive institutions. But, in fact, my opponent admits what I have said on the impropriety of attempting to establish positive institutions by inferential reasoning; for he wishes to make it appear, that he can produce an express warrant for infant baptism, from the covenant made with Abraham 2000 years before the institution of Christian Baptism. But alas for his plan! He begins to exhibit his express authority by telling us, if he can do this, and if he can do that, then he can do a third thing—that is, afford a positive command for infant baptism. I do not know what he could not prove, if we should grant him all that he could claim with two or three *ifs*.—I have, then, furnished two express commands, the one for praying every where, and the other for all disciples to partake of the Lord's supper. Now let him produce an express command for all infants to be baptised, and I shall not ask him to prove that they are of the masculine or feminine gender—or, if he cannot do this, let him furnish one precedent from the Bible for infant baptism, and then I give up the cause, and will act accordingly.

He entertained us for some time on the households that are mentioned in the New Testament, as baptised; and would thence infer, that infants must have been baptised. This has often been the dernier resort of Pedo-baptists—

but, after all that has been said upon this topic, they are not able, from it, even to obtain what is called presumptive evidence, for this practice. Had there been a thousand households mentioned in the New Testament as baptised, and a supposition founded upon each one of them, these thousand suppositions would not constitute one solitary proof or conclusive evidence. If we should arraign a man upon an indictment for murder, and adduce a thousand suppositions before a human tribunal that he was guilty of it, could we convict him of the crime? Most assuredly we could not. Should we then admit of evidence in matters of a conscientious nature in religious worship, that we would not, that we could not admit betwixt man and man in temporal concerns.

There are but four households mentioned, but four suppositions adduced in support of the Pedit-baptist cause—Let us now examine them—We shall begin with the household of Cornelius, Acts 10. Who was Cornelius, and what was his house or family previous to his hearing Peter preach? Cornelius, a proselyte of the Jews' religion, was a Roman Centurion—"a devout man, and one that feared God *with all his house.*" This looks like infants in the first place!! Peter was sent to preach to him, and convince him that Jesus of Nazareth was the Christ or Messiah of the Jews. "Cornelius called together his kinsmen and near friends"—Peter preached to them *all*—"The Holy Ghost fell upon *them all* which heard the word," v. 44. Then Peter commanded them *all* to be baptized—What now comes of the supposed infants of Cornelius's household? They all feared God, they all heard the word of the Lord, "the holy spirit fell on them all," "they spoke with tongues," "they magnified God" "and they were all baptized." The imaginary infants of the household of Cornelius when the 10th chap. of the Acts is read, come out distinguished believers and notable saints.

The next household recorded, Acts 16, is that of Lydia. Who this Lydia was, we know not; whether she had ever been married, no man living can tell; whether she ever was a mother, no man knows: she was a travelling merchant, and had come from the city of Thyatira to Philippi, to dispose of her wares; she had a retinue of attendants, had a house at Philippi, and went to hear Paul preach. The Lord opened her heart, she believed,

and was baptized with her household. In the brief statement which we have recorded, but few items are specified; and had it not been for a note we have in the 40th verse of this chapter, we would have been left altogether to conjecture what kind of domestics composed her household. The 40th verse prohibits the supposition of infants—for we are told that Paul, at her request, after he was discharged from prison, visited her family, and that “when they had entered the house of Lydia and had seen the *brethren* and *comforted* them they departed.” So that these supposed infants were *brethren* in the faith, capable of receiving *comfort* from the words of the Apostle.

The next household mentioned is the Jailor’s. “He and all his was baptized.” Of this household we learn the following particulars, Acts 16, 31—34. 1st. “Paul preached salvation to him and *his house*.” 2d. Paul “spoke the word of the Lord to *him* and to *all* that were in his house” (infants and adults!) 3d. “He and all his was baptized.” And 4th. “He rejoiced, *believing in God with all his house*.” So that he supposed infants of this house were capable of having a sermon preached to them, of believing, of rejoicing in God, and of being baptized.

The last household is that of Stephanas. Paul baptized this household himself—and the supposed infants of this household, from a hint in the 15th verse, 16th chap. 1 Ep. to Cor. were saints of the first magnitude. “Ye know the house of Stephanas, that it is the first fruits of Achaia, and that *they* have addicted *themselves* to the ministry of the saints.” So that all Mr. W’s. supposed infants in all these households, when their character is examined, come out distinguished characters, believers, saints, worshippers of God, joyful christians, active disciples of Christ. It is by such suppositions and conjectures, that my opponent maintains his system; but, when patiently examined, they resemble the baseless fabric of a vision, that leaves not a wreck behind.

I shall now review the interpretation of the 127th psalm, which Mr. W. has given you. This Psalm begins with these words: “Except the Lord do build the house the builders lose their pain”—“Except the Lord watch the city the watchmen watch in vain”—“It is vain for you to rise up early, to sit up late, to eat the bread of sorrows—for so he giveth his beloved sleep.” The intention of

these sayings, is plainly to shew us that the efforts of man, even in the common concerns of this life, without the divine blessing, are in vain. The Psalmist proceeds to shew, with a particle of surprize, "Lo," even children themselves, which are born by ordinary generation, "are an *heritage* or gift of the Lord to parents, and the fruit of the womb is his reward to them." It is not by their own efforts alone, that they obtain these so common blessings. Now what a perversion of a plain portion of scripture, to attempt to shew, from these words, that infants are, in a spiritual sense, the inheritance of the Lord, or a reward or gift presented to him by their parents. This is just the reverse of the meaning of the psalm. If, my friends, such be the interpretation of scripture you are accustomed to receive from Mr. W. you must be blind indeed, and must fall into the ditch together. Hoping that Mr. W. will, by this time, be prepared to answer those questions I have proposed, and that he will keep close to the covenants, I will give place to him.

Mr. Walker then rejoined :

I think we will do some good now; we are going to work in a more methodical way. I think Mr. C. is going to keep to the subject now—I will proceed to answer his questions, and then I shall propose him a few.

His first question was, "Are these covenants the same in respect of the nature and extent of the privileges secured to the respective subjects of each?"—I answer, yes, and appeal to Deut. 30, 6, as proof of the truth of my answer. "And the Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God, with all thine heart and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live." This promise, under the old covenant, or covenant of circumcision, includes all spiritual blessings that are promised under the new covenant, and therefore demonstrates that the blessings are the same under both. The circumcision of the heart is a metaphorical phrase that denotes the agency of the spirit of God, as much as any promise under the new covenant, and declares a renovation of mind, as spiritual as any change described under the gospel dispensation. The promise connected with it, assures the subject under it, that the object of this promise is spiritual life—"that thou mayest live"—

It also has a respect unto the seed of those that are thus circumcised in heart; for the same blessing is extended to their seed, "and the heart of thy seed;" so that not only the heart of the parents, but the hearts of their seed, are the objects of the Divine grace promised in it.

The second question here proposed was, Are they the same in respect of the interesting or entitling condition, that is, is the ground of interest or claim the same in both? To this I answer, with the greatest confidence, that the righteousness of Christ is the condition of the enjoyment of any blessing; consequently the condition or ground of claim under both covenants is the same. I maintain that temporal blessings as well as spiritual, are enjoyed through Christ, or were a part of Christ's purchase, and therefore, with the greatest propriety, can it be affirmed, that all the blessings mankind ever enjoyed, even the very least, are enjoyed through his righteousness—And with regard to his third question, Is the condition of the continued enjoyment of the covenanted blessings the same in both covenants? I answer, that they are enjoyed upon the same footing. I cannot perceive any great difference betwixt this query and the preceding. Whatever blessedness we enjoy, and in what manner we enjoy it, equally flow from the satisfaction of Christ, or in consequence of his purchase. The righteous have temporal as well as spiritual blessings promised them—"their bread shall be given them, and their water shall be sure;" and on what footing are these blessings promised them, if not through Christ, by whom we enjoy all blessings and all grace?

I am now going to propose Mr. C. a few questions, such as I presume he will have no objections to answer, and which are as intimately connected with his principles, as those he has proposed are with mine.

The first I propose to him is—Was the blessedness of Abraham a spiritual blessedness; that blessedness of which Paul speaks, Rom. 4, was it a temporal or a spiritual blessedness?

Query 2d—When did Abraham get that blessedness; in circumcision, or in uncircumcision?

Query 3d—Was earthly Canaan sealed or secured to Ishmael in circumcision; and if not, how could circumcision seal to all its specified subjects an inheritance in Canaan?

When these questions are answered, I have a few others to propose, to which I hope Mr. C. will give plain and pertinent answers—in the mean time he may proceed.

I then replied :

Mr. W. has answered those questions I proposed to him very explicitly, and desires that I should do the same. To his answers and queries I will attend in due time ; in the mean time, that he may have time for reflection, I will propose him three more, which he will doubtless be prepared to answer when he next speaks.

Query 4th—If both covenants are the same, in what respect is the new said to be "*better*" than the old ?

Query 5th—Are the duties enjoined upon the covenantees the same in both ?

Query 6th—Are the penalties threatened the same in both ?

[Here I was interrupted by Mr. Findley, who objected to this mode of proceeding ; he said, that as the object of this meeting was the edification of the public, he could not conceive how the asking and answering of questions, could promote their edification—he desired that we should proceed in some way more conducive to their edification : To which I replied—Mr. Findley, you are doubtless an advocate for the Westminster creed and catechism, and I presume, as such, must agree with your brethren, that the catechetical mode of instruction is the best.—As we are now proceeding as the Westminster Divines direct, I think you cannot, without a dereliction of principle, object.—Mr. Findlay then was mute.—I proceeded :]

Having submitted three additional questions, I proceed to review the answers Mr. W. gave to mine.

To the first he replied, that the covenants were the same in the nature and extent of their privileges—Then Mr. W. must affirm, that the covenant of circumcision promised—a new heart, pardon of sins, the gift of the Holy Ghost, and eternal life, to the specified subjects of it!!—For the New Covenant absolutely promises these blessings to the subjects of it. Thus the *new* is better than the *old*.

In my comment on the New Covenant Heb. 8, which I presented yesterday, I fully proved and Mr. W. did not attempt to refute it, that the new covenant absolutely

and unconditionally secured to every subject of it all spiritual blessings. To substantiate this answer Mr. W. quoted Deut. 30, 6—from which verse he attempted to prove, that the promise to circumcise their heart, implied all spiritual blessings—I deny that the phrase “*to circumcise the heart*” can, in its utmost latitude of interpretation, imply all the blessings promised in the New Covenant. But this is not necessary to prove in the mean time, for this promise, whatever it may signify, belonged not to all the specified subjects of the old covenant, nor to any of them, as such, unconditionally; nor was it a part of that covenant as given to Abraham.—In the days of Moses it was a promise relating to events then future.—The proof of this last declaration is to be found in the first five verses of this same chapter, “And it shall come to pass, when all these things are come upon thee, the blessing and the curse (temporal) which I have set before thee, and shalt call them to mind among all the nations, whither the Lord thy God hath driven thee; and shalt return unto the Lord thy God, and shalt obey his voice, according to all that I command this day, thou and thy children”—then, at that time, “I will circumcise thy heart, and the heart of thy children” &c.—When these verses are read, Mr. W’s. scheme vanishes into thin air, and his quotation is altogether irrelevant to his purpose.

I presume Mr. W. will not deny that circumcision was the same in import to the children of Israel at all times, and in all places—I think he will not say that circumcision implied any more 600 or 1000 years after its institution, than at first—if so, then any promise published in the days of Moses, respecting future things, can have no bearing upon the covenant of circumcision established four or five hundred years before. Moreover, in the days of Moses, in those very times, to which Mr. W. has appealed, for a promise importing spiritual blessings—yes, in the chapter immediately preceding the one he has cited—although they had had the benefit of circumcision for so many hundred years—Moses declares—29th, 4th, “The Lord hath not given you an heart to perceive, and eyes to see, and ears to hear, *unto this day.*” Where, now, are the spiritual blessings promised to the subjects of circumcision as such!—What spiritual blessings had it secured for so long a time!! Is this the respect in which the two covenants are the same!!!—O human tradition, how

hast thou biassed the judgment and blinded the eyes of them that should know—under thy influence we can strain out a gnat and swallow a camel!

With regard to his answer of the second question, I must observe, that he is obliged to give up his own system, or the system of the Seceders, as well as to oppose the plainest statement in the Bible, to support his cause. He affirms that the righteousness of Christ is the entitling condition under both covenants, therefore they are the same in this respect. To illustrate this, he asserts that all temporal blessings, as well as spiritual, are enjoyed through his righteousness. The covenanters of Europe maintained this thesis, and the seceders opposed it. The seceders in Scotland, maintained that it was derogatory to the redemption of Christ, to suppose that he died "to purchase food and raiment for mankind, which the Almighty has given to the brutes that perish." Moreover, the seceders affirmed, that it was an error of a very pernicious tendency, to say, that wicked men dying impenitent, had enjoyed any part of the purchase of Christ, which, upon the Covenanter's hypothesis, they must, if their food and raiment, houses, lands, and tenements, were a part of his purchase. Mr. W. then abandons the "Mother kirk" of Scotland, and joins the Covenanters of Europe, in order to maintain, that the covenant of circumcision is the same as the covenant of Grace.—This, however, is with me a small matter if he did not also oppose Moses and Paul. His brethren and he may settle these differences among themselves, but, with respect to the ground of claim being the same under both covenants, I have to observe, that it is most manifestly an error—the ground of claim under the covenant of circumcision, was carnal descent from Abraham alone.—On that footing, and on no other, were all the privileges of the covenant of circumcision claimed. "We have Abraham to our father," was all the reason the Jews submitted, as their claim of privilege.—And on this footing they presumed so far, as to claim the privileges of the dispensation of John the Baptist. Yea, on this same footing, they continued to claim, even when converted to Christianity, a continuation of Jewish peculiarities. The Apostle Paul taught them, that no privileges were any longer to be claimed on the footing of carnal descent—even that all the spiritual privileges, promised to the spiritual seed of Abraham, were to be claimed

and enjoyed on a footing quite different from the obsolete claim. It runs in these words, "*If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to promise.*" Of the temporal privileges promised to the natural seed of Abraham in the covenant of circumcision, this was the claim. "*If ye be Abraham's seed through Sarah, then are ye heirs according to promise.*"—Of the spiritual privileges promised to the spiritual seed of Abraham, in the covenant confirmed before of God in Christ 25 years before the covenant of circumcision, this was the claim—"If ye be Christ's then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise."—This distinction is abundantly evident, and should forever terminate the controversy betwixt the Baptists and bedo-baptists, on the subject of Baptism.

Mr. W's answer to my third query, is as contradictory to fact and plain scripture, as either of the preceding, and shews to what an awful extremity he is driven to maintain the cause he has unscripturally espoused. I am convinced that when his answers to these queries appear in print, he will be ashamed of them. However, as he has promised to abide by the consequences resulting from these answers, I shall comment on them in his own words.

The continued enjoyment of the privileges of these two covenants, he says, was on the same footing—Now the enjoyment of them was at first of grace, or mere favor; or, in other words, the institution of both of them was an act of grace. But the *continued* enjoyment of them was upon different principles—The first depended upon an *if*—it was conditional, they were to enjoy it so long as they were "*willing and obedient*"—consequently by their disobedience they were excluded, and the nation stands to this day excluded from the enjoyment of the privileges of that covenant. This is a fact indisputable. Now the New Covenant is better than the old, because it is established upon better promises; and, being unconditional, it cannot be broken. The language of both covenants fully expresses their difference—The old abounds with conditions—if ye do so, and if ye do so—The new speaks absolutely—"they shall know me—they shall be my people." These things being so, the privileges of these two covenants are not enjoyed on the same footing.—The first was enjoyed in such a way as it might be forfeited, the second is enjoyed by Grace, and not one of its subjects has ever been excluded from the enjoyment of it.

Having now reviewed Mr. W's answers, and having shown that in them "there remain errors," I proceed to answer his queries.—His first query is—"was the blessedness of Abraham a spiritual blessedness?"—And his second query is like unto this, viz. "When did Abraham get this blessedness that was sealed to him?"—There is, I answer, no peculiar blessedness spoken of in scripture, as belonging so remarkably to Abraham, as to be emphatically called his blessedness—perhaps Mr. W. means the righteousness of Abraham, of which the Apostle speaks.—When he informs me what he means by this blessedness, I will answer his questions.

His third query is so distinctly stated, that I cannot mistake his meaning—it is this—Was the earthly [Canaan] sealed to Ishmael in circumcision? I answer, No—And the reason was, he was not a specified subject of that Covenant.—The proof of this is Gen. 17, 18, 19—Abraham prayed that Ishmael might live before God, with a reference to the covenant that God had revealed to him—The Lord, verse 19th, informed him that his covenant would be with Isaac, saying, "Sarah shall bear thee a son, and thou shalt call his name Isaac, and I will establish my covenant *with him* to be an everlasting covenant, and with *his seed* after him." The reason why circumcision did not seal all the same things to Ishmael as to Isaac, was, because he was not a specified subject of the covenant of circumcision.

Having now attended to every thing necessary at this time, Mr. W. may proceed.

Mr. W. then proceeded:

Mr. C's. fourth question is intended to clash with the answer I gave to the first he proposed.—If the covenant of circumcision be the same as the new covenant, as I have said; he asks how could the new be better than the old? This does not interfere with the answer I have given; for two things may be essentially the same and yet some little difference. The chief, and indeed the sole difference, betwixt the old and the new, is that there were many carnal ordinances connected with the first, that are now taken away, and not connected with the new. But this being only an external circumstance does not affect the substantial part of the old covenant.—The covenant of circumcision remains, in all its grand features and pro-

perties, the same. One thing may be said to be better than another, although there is not much difference or no essential difference between them.

The fifth query he has proposed, has respect unto the duties enjoined upon the respective subjects of both covenants; he asks me, are they the same? I will answer this question very briefly—"they are substantially the same"—Duties have ever been very similar, moral duties are always the same—It is the duty of men to pray and praise, to be just and honest, to be virtuous and upright, and these duties were equally enjoined upon Jews and Christians under the covenant of circumcision, and under the New Covenant—So that I hesitate not to say, that the duties incumbent upon the subjects of both covenants are the same.

His sixth query, respecting the penalties under both covenants, was, Are the penalties threatened the same in both? This question I will answer by saying that there are no penalties under either, consequently there can be no difference in this respect betwixt the old and the new.

I have now to propose again to Mr. C. those questions he declined answering from some alledged ambiguity in the word "*blessedness*"—David, as quoted by Paul, Rom. 4, describeth the blessedness of the man to whom the Lord imputeth righteousness without works.—As Abraham was said to be a partaker of that righteousness, he was doubtless a partaker of that blessedness too. I again ask the same question.

Was that blessedness a spiritual or a temporal blessedness? And secondly, when did Abraham get that blessedness?

A 4th question I will now propose, predicated on his answer to the query respecting Ishmael, viz. What did circumcision seal to Ishmael? He affirms that he was not a specified subject of the covenant of circumcision, and could not have an interest in Canaan: why then was he circumcised? I think Mr. C. is got into a close place now; I wish to see how he will get out.

I have to object to Mr. C's comment on my answer to his first question; he says that the mere promise, to circumcise the heart, could not, in the utmost latitude of interpretation, mean or import so much, as all the blessings promised under the New Covenant.—Now certainly to circumcise the heart, is the work of the spirit of God.—

The holy spirit is the agent or operator of all those spiritual changes that take place on the understanding, will and affections of the human soul. Now, it is almost universally admitted, that, as the spirit is the agent of all gracious changes, so the changes which it produces are spiritual and permanent, and must imply a radical change of heart. If the human heart is then thus changed by the spiritual circumcision, it must be a meet subject for the enjoyment of spiritual blessedness, consequently prepared for Heaven. Now, as the end of all gracious operations, is to fit us for Heaven, and as the circumcision of the heart is a gracious operation, eternal life must be implied in the promise of circumcising the heart. From these considerations it must follow, that as this gracious change was promised to the Jews under the old covenant, and as many of them doubtless enjoyed it, their privileges were as great as ours.—When the promises under the Old Covenant were so great, and so spiritual, as to make men fit for Heaven, I do not see any just cause we have to glory so much over them. We can only get to Heaven with all our privileges.—I must then, under these considerations, still maintain, that the two covenants, in respect of the extent and nature of their privileges, are the same.

Again—with respect to his comments on the answers I gave to the second and third queries.—If they are to be taken as he expresses himself, they would lead us to suppose that he is an Old Testament Armenian and a New Testament Calvinist. He talks of so many conditions under the old covenant, that he appears to suppose that men were saved conditionally under it. And under the new, he argues an unconditional salvation; so that, according to him, the way of salvation is diverse under the two testaments. I must, then, think, that he runs into greater extremes, than those of which he accuses me.—Allowing him an opportunity of correcting himself, I sit down.

I then observed,

That as Mr. Walker has explained his acceptation of the word "*blessedness*" to mean, that blessedness which all the righteous enjoy in consequence of justifying righteousness, and of which Abraham was eminently possessed, I proceed to answer his questions: and first—Was that blessedness which Abraham enjoyed as a conse-

quence of his righteousness, a temporal or a spiritual blessedness? This being the way in which the question now stands, I answer, it was a spiritual blessedness. And the second question—When did Abraham get this blessedness; in circumcision or in uncircumcision? I answer, he obtained this blessedness through that righteousness of which he was possessed when he believed God, Gen. 12, 3, and which was accounted unto him for righteousness—Abraham, then, obtained this righteousness and blessedness, 25 years before the institution of circumcision, and therefore circumcision was to him, what it never was to any other circumcised person, “a sign and seal of that righteousness,” which he had 25 years before he was circumcised. Neither these two questions nor the answers I have given them, affect the subject as it now stands. If Mr. W. could shew that Abraham or his seed received, in, or by the covenant of circumcision, either righteousness or spiritual blessedness, it might be, in some measure, pertinent to the subject—but this is what neither he nor any other man can do.

His fourth question, What did circumcision seal to Ishmael? I now proceed to answer: Circumcision to all the seed of Abraham, specified in the covenant of circumcision, secured the same blessings; but Ishmael was not contemplated as interested in the covenant of circumcision, seeing the promise was, “in Isaac shall *thy seed* be called”—Yet circumcision was a token and seal to him, that God would make of him a great nation, because he was a son of Abraham. On this account, and for the same reason that Abraham’s slaves were circumcised, was Ishmael circumcised. The promise to Ishmael was fulfilled, and in process of time that warlike and strong nation called the Hagarens, arose from him. Esau, and his posterity, the Edomites, were rejected from the privileges of this covenant, in consequence of Esau’s selling his birth-right; and as all the privileges of the old covenant were conditional, it does not interfere with the view I have taken of it, although the Jews should have been banished from Canaan, for their tenure of it depended on their good behavior. These circumstances, when clearly investigated, confirm more fully the grand difference betwixt the old covenant and the new. The grand difference betwixt them may be comprehended in a few words, viz: The blessings of the covenant of circumci-

ion were all temporal, and had a typical reference to the person and kingdom of the Messiah; the blessings of the new covenant are all spiritual and real—the former were enjoyed conditionally; the latter unconditionally—the former might be, and they were, forfeited; the latter could not be, and were never, forfeited—the subjects of the former were, as such, a carnal people; the subjects of the latter as such are a spiritual people—the subjects of the former were such by natural birth; the subjects of the latter are such by regeneration or supernatural birth. Having now answered all Mr. Walker's queries, I proceed to remark on the brief comment he submitted on my observations on his answers to the three first questions I proposed: He has attempted to persuade you that the phrase "to circumcise the heart," imported all the spiritual blessings of the new covenant; but why make this effort until he had proved, or attempted to prove, that this promise was a *part* of the covenant of circumcision. This he has prudently declined. It is no matter, for his scheme, what that promise implied, seeing I have proved that that promise was *no part* of the covenant of circumcision, and no man can invalidate the reasoning I have adduced on that subject. What an absurdity would it involve, if he should affirm that every promise published from the days of Moses till the Messiah's advent, was a part of the covenant of circumcision! And yet this would be as reasonable as to say that that promise, Deut. 10, 6, was a *part* of that covenant. It is, then, of no importance to me to disprove his comment on that promise, seeing it is altogether foreign to the subject. Yet it is no small evidence of his want of documents, and fondness to prove what is inadmissible; to hear him alledging that these words, "to circumcise the heart," mean to forgive sins, to pour out the Holy Spirit, in a new covenant sense, to bestow eternal life, and every other spiritual and eternal blessing contained in the New Testament! But as I said before, it is no matter what these words import; they are no part of the covenant of circumcision, but were spoken 4 or 500 years after its completion, and *then* had respect unto a time future.

On my remarks on his answers to the 2d and 3d questions, he supposes that I am an Old Testament Arminian, and a New Testament Calvinist. This may serve to obviate the difficulty of attempting to disprove my re-

marks on his answers, but cannot carry conviction to any mind. I have often had sufficient evidence to say, that my opponent argued like an Old and a New Testament Arminian; but what is Calvin and who is Arminius?—the names of Walker and Campbell require as much breath to pronounce them, weigh as heavy, and are composed of as many vowels and consonants as Calvin or Arminius.

If to say, that all the blessings of the covenant of circumcision, were conditional, be Arminianism, I am an Arminian;—and if to say, that all the blessings of the New Covenant are unconditional, and enjoyed by grace, is Calvinism, I am a Calvinist. But as Mr. Walker admits that the privileges of both covenants are the same in nature and extent, and as those of the Jews were conditional, doubtless he, on his own assertion, is an Old and a New Testament Arminian.

Previous to my reviewing his answers to the last three questions, I must, to afford him time for deliberation, now propose him other three.

Query 7th—Was not Abraham by covenant the father of a two-fold seed, a natural and a spiritual, Gen. 12th, 2 & 3, and Rom. 4th, 11 & 12?

Query 8th—Did not Abraham's spiritual seed consist first of Christ, and all that in him inherit the faith of the father of the faithful, whether Jews or Gentiles, and of them only? Rom. 4th, 11 & 12.

Query 9th—Did not the covenant of circumcision exclusively belong to the natural seed of Abraham, as such, and to them only, as specified Gen. 17?

I shall conclude my discourse, at this time, with a few remarks on his answers to the 4th, 5th and 6th questions, which I proposed to him.

The 4th was, Wherein was the new a better than the old covenant, if they are the same in the nature and extent of their privileges? To this he replied, that the carnal ordinances being taken away rendered it better; but the Apostle leads us to consider it better on quite different grounds, viz. because "established upon better promises." Mr. W. says the superiority consists in ordinances—Paul says in promises: better promises with Paul makes a better covenant—with Mr. W. an abrogation of carnal ordinances makes it a better covenant. A "better priesthood," a "better mediator," and "better promises," characterize it a better covenant in Paul's view.

and it is doubtless better for us to adhere to the Apostle Paul than to Mr. Walker.

Mr. W. answers the 5th question as he has done all the preceding, with an eye to keep up the tottering fabric which will fall, and is now falling upon him: He says the duties are constantly the same under both covenants—that is “an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth,” is the same as “resist not evil”—“hate your enemy,” is the same as “love your enemies!!” The new commandment “love one another” for Christ’s sake, is the same as “love your neighbor” as a fellow creature—the duty of being baptised, of commemorating Christ’s death, &c. are just the same in substance as being circumcised, and eating the passover, &c.!! The paying of tythes to the Levites, the buying and selling slaves of the heathen, the laws concerning ploughing, gathering the vintage, wearing apparel, &c. are all the same in substance with paying stipends to the clergy, buying and selling slaves in the United States, &c.—What a compound of inconsistencies is necessary to constitute a Pedit-baptist!!!

Mr. Walker’s answer to the 6th question finishes the grand climax to which we have been for some time approximating. I stand on the first ground, on which I have ever heard that there are no penalties attached to either covenant. I am very much mistaken, if the seceders do not call Mr. W. to an account for the answers he has this day given to these questions. If they do not, they are far apostatized from the zeal and doctrine of their brethren on the other side of the Atlantic. But, perhaps, they find it necessary to give up with other tenets, in order to maintain infant baptism.—I will now read you some portions of scripture, which will point out the nature and difference of the penalties threatened under both covenants.

The penalties annexed to the old covenant, were numerous and severe. They are specified by Moses, in the book of Deuteronomy, at great length, chap. 28, 15—20—“If thou wilt not hearken unto the voice of the Lord thy God to observe to do all his commandments—that all these curses shall come upon thee and overtake thee: cursed shalt thou be in the city, and cursed shalt thou be in the field. Cursed shall be thy basket and thy store. Cursed shall be the fruit of thy body and the fruit of thy land, the increase of thy kine and the flocks of thy sheep.

Cursed shalt thou be when thou comest in, and cursed shalt thou be when thou goest out. The Lord shall send upon thee cursing, vexation and rebuke, in all that thou settest thine hand unto for to do, until thou be destroyed, and until thou perish quickly, because of the wickedness of thy doings whereby thou hast forsaken me. The Lord shall smite thee with a consumption and with a fever and with an inflammation, and with an extreme burning, and with the sword, and with blasting and with mildew; and they shall pursue thee until thou perish," &c. &c. These, and many more of a similar kind, were the curses or penalties annexed to the old covenant, to the violation of the statutes and precepts inculcated under it. There are about 40 verses of this chapter employed in exhibiting the curses to be poured out on the violaters of that covenant, and which ultimately fell upon the subjects of that covenant, for their departure from the precepts under it. The sum of all these curses or penalties is comprehended in one verse, Gen. 17, 14, and is there incorporated with the covenant as first proposed to Abraham. It runs in these words: "And the uncircumcised man-child, whose flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised, that soul *shall be cut off* from his people, *he hath broken my covenant.*" The *cutting off* from his people was the penalty first proposed, and it is comprehensive of all the curses fully exhibited in the chapter to which I have referred. Hence, in after times, the Jews were rejected, cut off, and thousands of them destroyed by the most awful calamities, in consequence of having incurred the penalties annexed to their covenant.

The penalties attached to the New are essentially dissimilar. In the 89th Psalm, when the promised seed is spoken of, his advent subjects and covenant, the penalties also are declared, and in prophetic language fully exhibited, verse 28—37. It reads thus—"My mercy will I keep for him for evermore, and my covenant shall stand fast with him. His seed also will I make to endure for ever, and his throne as the days of Heaven. If his children forsake my law, and walk not in my judgments, if they break my statutes and keep not my commandments, then will I visit their iniquity with the rod, and their transgression with stripes. *Nevertheless, my loving kindness will I not utterly take from him, nor suffer my faithfulness to fail.* My covenant will I not break, nor alter

the thing that is gone out of my lips." And from these words we would conclude, that the penalties annexed to the New were only fatherly chastisements, which would not utterly cut off or destroy the subjects or seed of this covenant.—But to have this more clearly and fully confirmed, I must request your attention to two portions of New Testament scripture, 1 Cor. 11—30, 31.—In this chapter the new covenant is exhibited in the Lord's supper, and the unworthy reception of this ordinance is marked out as a subject of the severest penalty under the New Testament. The verses alluded to thus read—"He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation (or judgment) to himself, not discerning the Lord's body. For this cause many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep. But if we would judge ourselves we should not be judged. But when we are judged we are chastened of the Lord that we should not be condemned with the world." Here the judgment, damnation or condemnation spoken of, is expressly affirmed to be a chastisement—to prevent a final condemnation or damnation with the world. Some of the Corinthians, for their unworthy participation of this ordinance, had been chastized even unto temporal death, to prevent eternal condemnation—"For this cause many are *weak and sickly* among you, and many *sleep*—die or are dead." Why? "That they might *not be condemned* with the world."—This corresponds admirably with the 89th psalm—"my loving kindness will I not utterly take from him." The last portion to which I shall call your attention at this time is Heb. 12th, 6—11: "For whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth. If ye endure chastening, God dealeth with you as with sons—for what son is he whom the Father chasteneth not?—For they verily for a few days chastened us after their own pleasure, but he for our profit, that we might be partakers of his holiness," &c.—From all which it appears that each covenant hath its sanctions or penalties, and that the penalties of the latter are essentially distinct from those of the former. The ultimate of all the penalties of the old covenant, was, the final and eternal rejection of refractory subjects, from being the people of God in any sense. But the ultimate of all the penalties of the new covenant, is, to make the subjects of it "partakers of his holiness," and to exempt them "from the condemnation of the world."

Mr. W. may proceed to refute these things if he can.

Mr. C. has continued to propose queries; to these I shall first attend. His seventh query, is, Was not Abraham by covenant constituted the father of a twofold seed; a natural and a spiritual seed? To this I answer, No.—He is the father of the faithful alone. Abraham, by covenant, was constituted the father of the faithful, and, as such, were all the promises given to him. The blessing of Abraham comes upon the faithful alone, consequently none else were included in that relation to Abraham. My opponent, no doubt, wishes to make it appear that he was the father of a twofold seed; it may be necessary for his system, that he should be such, but it is not necessary for mine.—I pass on to his next query, viz.—Did not Abraham's spiritual seed consist first of Christ, and all that in him inherit the faith of the father of the faithful, whether Jews or Gentiles, and of them only?—I answer, Yes.—Christ undoubtedly is the promised seed of Abraham, and those connected with him by faith are viewed through Christ as his spiritual seed. It makes no difference whether they are Jews or Gentiles by natural birth, when they believe in Christ they become the spiritual seed of Abraham. "For," saith the Apostle, "if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." The promise mentioned here is no doubt that recorded, Gen. 12, 3: "In thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed."—Of this inheritance, of which they are called heirs, Canaan was a type, a striking type, and consequently the ground or reason which interested the Jews in it, was emblematical of the ground or reason which interests Christians in the spiritual inheritance of the heavenly Canaan.

The ninth question proposed my opponent was—Did not the covenant of circumcision exclusively belong to the natural seed of Abraham, and to them only, as specified, Gen. 17?—To this question, I decidedly answer—No.—It belonged equally to all saints, ancient and modern, in consequence of faith in Christ.

I must now observe that the remarks made on the penalties of the two covenants by Mr. C. appear to me very strange indeed. I must still maintain that neither of the two covenants had a single penalty annexed to them.—The hanging of a man for murder, because forbidden by the law of Christ, may as well be called a penalty of the

covenant of grace, as any penalty of the covenant of circumcision. Corrective punishments are not penalties.—Nothing is worthy of the name of penalty, but eternal damnation. And this has been the unhappy fate of many under the legal and the evangelical dispensation—Mr. O's comment on penalties, would lead us to view all the punishments inflicted on the subjects of any state professing Christianity, as penalties of the covenant of grace.

[Here there was a mere repetition of his remarks made during the two periods he had last spoken, and a renewal of his assertions on the spiritual import of circumcision, which led me briefly to propose the following queries.]

Mr. Walker will please answer the following queries, viz.

What did circumcision seal to Ishmael?

Did circumcision naturally and primarily refer to a change of heart?

Did circumcision signify any thing 600 years after its institution, that it did not signify at its first appointment?

With regard to Mr. Walker's observations on penalties, I merely observed, that his views must be peculiar to himself—that no man acquainted with the meaning of the word penalty could say, that nothing short of eternal damnation could be called a penalty of a divine law.—According to him there can be no degrees of comparison of penalties—no great no small penalties.—Now the term penalty, or its corresponding word punishment, is, in laws civil and divine, proportioned to the real or supposed degrees of demerit contained in crimes.—Hence the penalties of the infraction of certain laws, are fines, imprisonment, confiscation of goods, penitentiary, exile and death.—What an absurdity would it be, if I should affirm, that neither fines, imprisonments, confiscation of goods, or exile, were any penalty or punishment inflicted on transgressions, that unless a man was killed he was not punished. Such is the import of Mr. W's objection to the views I have given of the penalties of the two covenants.—But to settle the matter at once, I would ask, is there any thing less than eternal death in the sacred scripture called penalty, or punishment? Answer Yes—and quote the words of an afflicted man—Jer. 3, 39—“Why should a living man complain, a man for the punishment of his sins!”—I presume that no man will deny that this is a temporal affliction that is here called—“poena,” pen-

alty, or punishment.—Excommunication from the church is called—penalty or punishment, by the Apostle, 2 Cor. 2, 6—“Sufficient to such a man—(the excommunicated fornicator) is the *penalty* or *punishment* inflicted of many.” It may not be amiss here to observe, that in Hebrew, Greek, Latin, French, and English, the same word denotes both penalty and punishment. The word penalty, is obviously derived from “*poena*,” and the first meaning of “*poena*” is punishment; (see Schrevelius’ Greek, Stokii Clavis linguæ Sanctæ Veteris Testamenti, and Lyttleton’s Latin Dictionary, on this word.)

To Mr. W’s answers to my last queries, I shall briefly reply.—He denies that Abraham, by covenant, was constituted the father of a twofold seed, a natural and a spiritual seed—He expressly declares “that he was the father of the faithful alone.” That is the most flat contradiction of plain scripture testimony, I have heard from the lips of a professed teacher of religion. “I have made thee (by covenant) the father of many nations,” saith God to him, Rom. 4th, 17th, and in the same chapter, saith the spirit (verses 11, 12)—“And he received the sign of circumcision—that he might be the father of all them that believe though they be not circumcised”—“and the father of the circumcision”—not only as their natural father—to such of them “as walk in the steps of the faith of *our father Abraham*.”

I presume there is no man who ever read the Bible once through, that has not discovered that Abraham is both a natural and a spiritual father, according to the covenant that God made with him. That he was the natural father of the whole Jewish nation; and the spiritual father of all true believers, whether Jews or Gentiles—Mr. Walker himself, I am convinced, has often observed it; and it is now owing to the confusion of his mind, and the pernicious tendency of a corrupt system, that he does not confess it.

His answer to my eighth question is the first correct and scriptural answer that he has given—I admit it without any exception—And it is nearly as strange to me that he should *now* answer one question correctly, as that he should have answered seven erroneously!!

His answer to my ninth query is as unscriptural as any of his first seven answers. He says, that the covenant of circumcision belonged equally to the natural seed and the spiritual seed of Abraham, i. e. to believing Jews and

Gentiles, as well as to the whole nation of Israel—I should wish to hear him explain, how we Gentiles, who profess to be among Abraham's spiritual seed, are interested in the promises of Canaan, and in a numerous offspring, &c. If this be so—we should set on foot another holy crusade, and attempt to rebuild the holy city and the temple!!!—But I forbear to comment further on his answers.

Mr. Walker then proceeded—Observing, that he was ready to say that circumcision sealed every thing to Ishmeal that it had sealed to Isaac, or to any of the circumcised nation. That circumcision had a reference, primarily, to the renovation of the mind; and that it had the same import 600 years after its institution that it had at, or upon, its first appointment. My opponent has laboured much to destroy infant baptism, a rite of sacred import, and of great antiquity. Yesterday he insinuated that the rite was borrowed from the Church of Rome, and that the arguments I have used to support it, are chiefly borrowed from the same source. In reply to these insinuations, which should not pass unnoticed, I have to say, that I am able to shew, that infant baptism existed before the Antichristian system of which he speaks, and that it was practised from the earliest antiquity—In order to accomplish this I will read some extracts from the primitive fathers, the successors of the Apostles.*

Justin Martyr, as early as the year 140, alludes to the fact of infant baptism, in these words, which are taken from his Apology: "Several persons among us, of 60 and 70 years old, and of both sexes, who were disciplined or made disciples to Christ in their childhood, do continue uncorrupted." In his dialogue Trypho, the application of baptism to persons of every age, is very clearly implied, thus: "We, also, who by him have had access to God, have not received this carnal circumcision, which

* The book from which Mr. W. read these extracts, was a Treatise lately published by John P. Campbell, of Kentucky, in support of infant baptism. The extracts read by Mr. Walker from this writer, were such as are usually argued by the pedo-baptists, in support of the antiquity of their cause. I do not recollect, nor do I find it in any of the notes taken on the occasion, in what order, or to what extent, the citations in John P. Campbell's book were read. But in the course of this work they shall all be attended to. In the mean time, I take up such as are most in favor of the pedo-baptists.

Enoch, and those like him, observed. And we have received it *by baptism*, by the mercy of God, because we were sinners: and it is enjoined to all persons to receive it in the same way"—namely, by baptism. And in another work we meet with this question: "Why, if circumcision be a good thing, we do not use 't as well as the Jews did?" This question he answers: "We are circumcised by baptism with Christ's circumcision."

About the year 176, and probably about 167, Ireneus, who had been bred in Asia, under the instruction of Polycarp the disciple of St. John, but was then bishop of Lyons in France, delivers a very convincing testimony to the practice of baptizing infants. Ireneus against Hereses, lib. 2, c. 59: "He (Christ) came to save all persons by himself; all, I say, who are regenerated unto God, (baptized) infants and little ones and children and youths. The phrase *regenerated unto God*, was, in the language of this Father, and all other writers of that age, descriptive of the fact of having been baptised. Justin Martyr more than once uses the word *regenerate* for *baptise*; thus—"Then they are brought by us to some place where there is water, and they are *regenerated* according to the *rite of regeneration*, by which we ourselves *were regenerated*; for then they are washed with water in the name of the Father and Lord of all things, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit."

Tertullian, who flourished from the year 194 till 216, thus speaks of infant baptism: "Therefore the delay of baptism is the more expedient, as it respects the condition and disposition as well as the age of every person to be baptised; and this, moreover, holds especially in reference to little ones; for what occasion is there, except in cases of urgent necessity, that the sponsors be bro't into danger, who are alike liable, through death, to fail in accomplishing their promises and to be deceived by the evolution of some evil disposition? Our Lord indeed says, *Do not hinder them from coming to me*; but then let them come when they grow up—let them come when they are informed and understand, *i. e.* the nature and design of the ordinance; when they are instructed, for what end they should come: *let them be made Christians when they shall have become able to know Christ*. Why does this innocent age hasten to the remission of sins, *i. e.* to baptism? Men act with more caution in secular concerns, than that

Divine interests should be confided to any one to whom it is considered improper to allow the disposal of earthly property. *Let them know how to seek this salvation, that you may appear to have given it to one that asketh.* For a reason no less weighty, unmarried persons should also have their baptism delayed on account of their being exposed to temptations; as well virgins by reason of their maturity, as widows by their wandering mode of life, until they either marry, or arrive at a confirmed continence.—They who understand the great weight of baptism, will dread rather the too hasty reception, than the delay of it; and a genuine faith is secure of salvation.”

“Tertullian believed, or it was the decided judgment of this Father, that, in the article of Baptism, the soul was *regenerated unto God*”—his words are, “Why dost thou, O Soul, (speaking of the resurrection) condemn the body? None is so near to thee whom thou shouldst love next to thy God; none more thy fellow than that which, along with thee, *was regenerated unto God.*” To make his meaning still more plain, as respects infant baptism, we shall cite his words in 1 Cor. 7th, 14, “So there is no child born *clean*, that is, among the heathens.” And hence, indeed, the Apostle says, that when either party in the married state is sanctified, the offspring are born *holy*, as well by the prerogative of birth, as by the discipline of religious institution. “Else, said he, they should be born *unclean*; intending that the children of believers should be considered as if *designated to holiness*, and by this also to salvation”—consequently deciding that by the pledges of this hope, those marriages might be defended, which he himself conceived ought to remain undissolved. Indeed, deciding differently, he had been admonished by the definitive sentence of our Lord, “except a man be born of water, and of the spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.” “Thus every soul is accounted, as in Adam, until it is *enrolled in Jesus Christ*, and is still *unclean* until it is so *enrolled*, and sinful because *unclean.*” Thus far Tertullian.

Origen thus speaks, Homilia 8, in Levit. C. 12—“Here, David speaking, ‘I was,’ said he, ‘conceived in *iniquity*, and in sin did my mother bring me forth;’ shewing, that every soul that is born in the flesh is polluted with the filth of sin and iniquity—and that therefore that was said which we mentioned before, that none is clean from pol-

lution, though his life be but the length of one day. Besides all this, let it be considered, what is the reason that, whereas the baptism of the church is given for the remission of sins, *infants also are, by the usage of the church, baptised*; when, if there were nothing in infants that wanted forgiveness and mercy, the grace of baptism would be needless to them."

Again: his Homilia in Lucam 14—"Having occasion given by this place, I will mention a matter which excites frequent inquiries among the brethren. Infants are baptised for the remission of sins. Of what sins—or when have they sinned? Or how can any reason of baptism be alledged in their case, unless it be in conformity to the sense just now expressed, namely, *that none is free from pollution, though his life be but the length of one day upon earth*? And it is for that reason, because, by the sacrament of Baptism, the pollutions of our birth are taken away, that infants are baptised."

Again: his comment on Romans, lib. 5—"And also in the law it is commanded, that a sacrifice be offered for every child that is born; a pair of turtle doves, or two young pigeons, of which one is for a sin offering, the other for a burnt offering. For what sin is this one pigeon offered? Can the child that is new born have committed any sin? It has even then sin, for which the sacrifice is commanded to be offered, from which even he whose life is but of one day, is denied to be free. Of this sin, David is to be supposed to have said that which we mentioned before, *'In sin did my mother conceive me'*—for there is, in the history, no account of any particular sin that his mother had committed. For this, also, it was, that the *church received a document or order from the Apostles to give baptism to infants*: for they to whom the divine mysteries were committed, knew that there is, in all persons, that native pollution of sin, which must be cleansed by the spirit and by water; by reason of which the body itself is called *the body of sin*." Thus far Origen, who flourished from 210 till 235.

Next comes St. Cyprian, who flourished from the year 248 till 254. Jerome speaks thus of St. Cyprian—"Blessed Cyprian declared not that *no body*, but that *no soul was to be lost*; and, with a number of his fellow Bishops, decreed that an infant might, with propriety, be baptised immediately after the birth; not thereby forming

some new canon, but observing the most firmly established faith of the church. This was alledged to correct some who wished to defer till the 8th day.

Augustin refers to St. Cyprian's letter, in his epistle 28th, ad Hieronym; thus—"Blessed Cyprian not making any new decree, but expressing the firm faith of the church, in refuting those who thought a child must not be baptised before the eighth day, said, not that *no flesh*, but that *no soul must be lost*." St. Jerome and St. Augustine both flourished at the close of the 4th century. The testimony of St. Jerome and St. Augustine is here cited, to establish the character of St. Cyprian against Danvers and Robinson. But I will now present you with an extract of this far-famed letter of St. Cyprian—Cyprian and the associate bishops present at the council, 66 in number—

"To Fidus, our brother, Greeting:

"We read your letter, very dear brother, in which you write of one Victor, a Presbyter, &c. But with respect to the case of infants, which, as you have stated, should not be baptised within the second and third day after their birth, and as to what you would also suggest, that the rule of the ancient circumcision is to be observed, requiring that none is to be baptised and sanctified before the 8th day after nativity; it has appeared far otherwise to us all in our council: for as to what you had conceived should be done in this affair, not a single person thought with you; but we all gave it as our opinion, that the mercy and grace of God should be denied to none of human kind. For since our Lord in his Gospel says, "*The son of man came not to destroy men's souls, but to save them*"—as much as possible, then, should we exert our best endeavors, that *no soul should be lost*. For what deficiency can there be in the human creature that has been formed in the womb by the hands of the Almighty? Such existences appear to us to attain increase in the course of the days of the world. But whatsoever things are the product of the Deity, derive their perfection from the majesty and work of God the maker. The authority of inspiratist informs us of the single equality of the Divine gift to all persons, whether infants or adults."—"On which account, we conceive that no person is to be prevented from obtaining grace by the law which is now established; and that the spiritual circumcision is not to be restricted by the circumcision which is of the flesh:

but that persons of every age and condition are to be admitted to the grace of Christ; since Peter, speaking in the Acts of the Apostles, declares, and our Lord has said, that *no person is to be called common or unclean*. But if any thing can prevent men from receiving this grace, it should seem rather that highly aggravated sins ought to shut out the adult and aged from obtaining it. And yet more, if to the vilest offenders, and to those who have once greatly sinned against God, the remission of sin is given when they shall have believed, and *if from baptism and grace no person is to be excluded*, by how much more should the infant be exempt from prohibition, who being but just born, has never sinned, otherwise than as sprung by a carnal birth from Adam, he has contracted, in the earliest moments of nativity, the contagion of death originally threatened? And who for this reason more easily obtains the remission of sins, because they are not his own, but others sins which are remitted to him. Therefore, very dear brother, this has been our decision in council, that *from baptism and the grace of God, who is merciful and benign and affectionate unto all, no person is to be prohibited by us*. Which, rule, seeing it ought to be regarded and attended to with respect to men in general, should, as we apprehend, be more especially observed in reference to mere infants, and to those too who are but just born." So speaks the St. Cyprian, who clearly shews us that the sense of the 66 bishops was, that infants even under 8 days old should be baptised.

The testimony of Augustine, who flourished at the close of the 4th century, is in the following words: "And as the thief, who, by necessity, went without baptism, was saved, because by his piety he had it spiritually—so where baptism is had, though the party by necessity go without *that* (faith) which the thief had, yet he is saved. Which the whole body of the church holds as delivered to them in the case of little infants baptised, who certainly cannot yet believe with the heart unto righteousness, or confess with the mouth unto salvation, as the thief could; nay, by their crying and noise, while the sacrament is administering, they disturb the holy mysteries; and yet *no christian man* will say they are baptised to no purpose. And if any one do ask for divine authority in this matter, though that which the whole church practises, and which *has not been instituted by councils, but was ever in use,*

is very reasonably believed to be no other than a thing *delivered (or ordered) by the authority of the Apostles*; yet we may, besides, take a true estimate how much the sacrament of baptism does avail infants, by the circumcision which God's former people received."

Jerome and Augustine asserted the baptism of infants for the remission of sins against Celestius and Pelagius, who denied original sin, as an evidence of original guilt, derived by infants from Adam. Pelagius and Celestius admit the fact of infant baptism as a general practice of the church, yet they alledge that their baptism was necessary not for the remission of sins, but because our Lord said "except a man be born of water and of the spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." Celestius said, that, "As for infants, I always said that they stand in need of baptism, and that they ought to be baptised." Pelagius, in his creed, has these words—"We hold *one baptism*, which we say ought to be administered with the same sacramental words to infants as it is to elder persons." Again, says Celestius—"We own that *infants* ought, according to the *Rule of the Universal Church*, and according to the sentence of the Gospel, to be baptised for the forgiveness of sins, because our Lord has determined that the kingdom of Heaven cannot be conferred upon any but baptised persons; which, because it is a thing that nature cannot give, it is needful to give it by the liberty of grace. But when we say that infants are to be baptised for forgiveness of sins, we do not say it with such intent as that we would seem to confirm the opinion of sin being by derivation, which is a thing far from the Catholic sense." Pelagius and Celestius lived in the 5th century—Chrysostom also, a cotemporary of Augustine and Jerome, united with them in opposing the Pelagians, and in vindicating infant baptism.

I have now submitted such evidence in favor of the antiquity and universality of infant baptism, as is sufficient to convince any unprejudiced person, that it was banded down from the Apostles to their immediate successors, and so became the common practice of ancient Christians; and that, instead of our arguments being derived from the church of Rome, in support of infant baptism, they are derived from a source of information existing many centuries before the church of Rome. Mr. C. may proceed.

[Here Mr. Findley said, that he and his associate moderator thought that enough had been said on the covenants, and that after I had spoken in reply to the things last urged by Mr. Walker, we should proceed to the mode of baptism.]

I then proceeded :*

I am glad that Mr. Walker is now willing to dismiss the arguments derived from the covenants, and that he has no more to say of my fondness to get off from this part of the controversy. I should willingly, however, have continued a little longer upon this part of the subject, as I have yet a few more questions to propose to him. As it is, however, determined, that enough has been said on this part of the subject, and as he has now gone into a lengthy citation of testimonies from ecclesiastical history, I shall decline, in the mean time, proposing him any more questions, and proceed forthwith to reply to his argument from history.

With regard to the answers he gave to the three last questions I proposed him, they are of a piece with his other answers. Two of them, viz. What did circumcision seal to Ishmael? and, Had circumcision primarily

* As I have already hinted, I have given a larger quantity of citations from John P. Campbell's book on baptism, than Mr. Walker read from it. This I did on two accounts; first, because I do not recollect precisely the quotations that he read from it; and because, in the second place, I intend my reply to extend equally to Mr. Walker and his authority, John P. Campbell. This I conceive necessary, as Mr. Walker selected this work as being the best author on his side of the question, and as containing the best authority from Ecclesiastical History, hitherto exhibited in any one work. As I have always considered the argument derived from circumcision, and that derived from ecclesiastical history, the two legs which support the system of Pedo-baptists, and on which they, themselves, lay the greatest stress, and by which they gain the greatest ascendancy over the minds of the unthinking mass of their adherents, I design that this work shall contain a full, a fair, and an unanswerable refutation of them. Whatsoever, therefore, necessary for this purpose, not suggested in the debate, shall appear in the appendix—In the mean time, I desire that the most apparently cogent and convincing testimonies in favor of infant baptism, from History, may be reviewed; and, in consideration of this, I am glad that John P. Campbell's book contains the best of them, and that Mr. W. has quoted the strongest of them..

and necessarily a respect to a change of heart? have been answered contradictory to fact.—Of all the questions I proposed him, two only have received answers from him agreeable to scripture, reason and fact. But as the fallacy and incongruity of his replies are sufficiently obvious from what I have already said, I proceed to investigate the evidence in his favor from church history.

That infant baptism and infant sprinkling are practices of great antiquity, no man conversant with ecclesiastical history will deny; but neither infant baptism nor sprinkling were taught or practised in the Christian church, for many years after the Apostolic age. This assertion I shall abundantly prove. The antiquity of any practice, or of any doctrine, not expressly revealed in sacred scripture, is, to a Christian, a matter of no consideration. There were many things taught and practised in the first and second centuries of Christianity, that all protestants, that all professed Christians except the church of Rome, reject as unscriptural, as unapostolical. If we then admit that any thing taught or practised in the first, second or third centuries, should be believed and practised now, *because of its antiquity*, we should admit and practice all things of equal antiquity. Again: if we quote some of those venerable fathers, as they are called, as authorities, who lived in those ancient times, we should take the *whole* of their testimony, and receive and practice all that they taught. Consistency, which is another name for reason, requires this at least. The 89 Apostolical canons, said to have been taught in the first century, and by many ascribed to the Apostles themselves, should be held by us, on these principles, as sacred as they are held by the church of Rome. Ecclesiastical history furnishes us with debates on certain doctrines and practices, in the first and second centuries, which some Christians still maintain, but which all presbyterians of every grade reject; and the very arguments which the Presbyterians use against Romanists and Episcopalians, will equally apply to themselves, when arguing in support of infant baptism. Some of those very authors, and others of still greater antiquity, which Mr. Walker has cited, are cited by Romanists and Episcopalians to establish the divine right of Episcopacy, the observance of Easter, the celibacy of the clergy, the doctrine of Purgatory, and other peculiarities of these religious communities. Let my opponent consider how

he would refute the arguments of the supporters of either Roman, German, or English Episcopacy, and he will soon discover how easily I will refute his.

There is a certain degree of veneration attached to things ancient. Even religious customs and ceremonies, that have no other authority than their antiquity, become venerable in the estimation of many. But the reverse should be the fate of unauthorized tradition, or unscriptural religious customs, how ancient so ever. Truth is more ancient than error, and will finally triumph. These general principles stated, I proceed to ascertain the antiquity of infant baptism, and to examine what credit is due the testimonies that have been presented from antiquity. I proceed to affirm that there is not any record extant in the world, that mentions infant baptism existing for 150 years after the Christian era. This declaration I make not upon the authority of any retailer of historical scraps, as John P. Campbell, or even the great Mr. Robinson, so formidable to the pedo-baptists, and the aforesaid Mr. Campbell; but upon a patient investigation of the only true sources of primitive antiquity; the writings of the immediate successors of the Apostles—the ecclesiastical history of Eusebius, the oldest and most authoritative on earth—and that of Du Pin, Doctor of the Sorbon, approved of by the holy mother Church, the greatest advocate in the world for tradition and ancient religious customs. 'Tis easy for any man of ingenuity to flourish away in detailing scraps, which appear in whatever light he is pleased to place them—and which, when torn from their context, become so passive in his hand, as to assume whatever features he pleases to impress on them. I beg your attention, while I read you every thing that is said on the doctrine of baptism, in the genuine epistles of the Apostolical fathers, St. Barnabas, St. Ignatius, St. Clement, St. Polycarp, and the Shepherd of Hermas; translated from the original Greek, by William, Lord Bishop of Lincoln's—from the second edition, London printed, 1710. I presume neither my opponent, nor many in this Western country, ever saw these epistles, as they are now very rare, even in Europe, and cannot but with great difficulty be obtained. "They contain a complete collection of the most primitive antiquity for 150 years after Christ." The first extract I shall make from these epistles will be from that of Barnabas, Paul's companion in travel, chap.

11. I will transcribe the whole chapter, which is the only one in his epistle on the subject.

"Let us now," says he, "enquire whether the Lord took care to manifest any thing before hand, concerning water and the cross. Now for the former of these, it is written to the people of Israel, how they shall not receive that baptism which brings to forgiveness of sins, but shall institute another to themselves that cannot—for thus saith the prophet, "Be astonished, O Heavens! and let the earth tremble at it, because this people have done two great and wicked things; they have left me, the fountain of living waters, and have digged for themselves broken cisterns that can hold no water. Is my holy mountain Zion, a desolate wilderness? For she shall be as a young bird when its nest is taken away." And again, the prophet saith, "I will go before thee and will make plain the mountains, and will break the gates of brass, and will snap in sunder the bars of iron: and will give thee dark and hidden and invisible treasures, that they may know that I am the Lord God." And again, "he shall dwell in the high den of the strong rock." And then what follows in the same prophet? "His water is faithful: ye shall see the king with glory, and your soul shall learn the fear of the Lord." And again, he saith, in another prophet: "He that does these things, shall be like a tree planted by the currents of water, which shall give its fruit in its season, its leaf also shall not wither, and whatsoever he doth it shall prosper. As for the wicked it is not so with them, but they are as the dust which the wind scattereth away from the face of the earth. Therefore the ungodly shall not stand in the judgment, neither the sinners in the council of the righteous. For the Lord knoweth the way of the righteous, and the way of the ungodly shall perish." "Consider how he hath joined both the cross and the water together. For this he saith; "Blessed are they *who putting their trust in the cross descend into the water*; for they shall have their reward in due time: then, saith he, will I give it them." But as concerning the present time, he saith "their leaves shall not fail." Meaning thereby, that every word that shall go out of your mouth, shall, through faith and charity, be to the conversion and hope of many. In like manner does another prophet speak:—"And the land of Jacob was the praise of all the earth;" magnifying thereby the vessels of his spirit; and what

follows? "And there was a river running on the right hand, and beautiful trees grew up by it; and he that shall eat of them shall live for ever." The signification of which is this:—*that we go down into the water full of sins and pollutions, but come up again bringing forth fruit; having in our hearts the fear and hope which is in Jesus by the spirit.* "And whosoever shall eat of them shall live forever." That is, whosoever shall hearken to those that call them and shall believe, shall live for ever."

Such is the whole testimony of St. Barnabas on the doctrine of baptism. I have read the whole chapter in which it occurs, and every hearer must perceive, that the only baptism taught and enjoyed in this Epistle of Barnabas, is the *immersion of believers*. He interprets Old Testament scriptures with a reference to it, and predicts from them, that a spurious baptism would be substituted in its stead. His prediction, alas, has proved too true!—I have here to observe, that there is nothing in this testimony of Barnabas, that does not perfectly coincide with the scripture doctrine of baptism; so that it is no *new revelation* of the spirit, but a confirmation of the revelation already made. I am sorry to say, that this last observation cannot be applied to many of those extracts made by my opponent.

The next extract which I make from this volume of primitive fathers, is from the Shepherd of Hermas.—This Hermas is commonly supposed to be that Hermas of whom Paul speaks, Rom. 16, 14: "Salute Asyncretus, Pelegon, Hermas, Patrobas, Hermes, and the brethren that are with them." In the book of Similitudes, chap. 16th, he compares the church to a tower, and particular members to stones. In relation to these stones the question is proposed—"Why did these stones come up out of the deep, and were placed into the building of this tower, seeing that they long ago carried those holy spirits?—It was necessary, said he, for them to *ascend by water*, that they might be at rest. For they could not otherwise enter into the kingdom of God, but by laying aside the mortality of their former life:—they, therefore, being dead, were *nevertheless* sealed with the seal of the son of God, and so entered into the kingdom of God. For before a man receives the name of the son of God, he is ordained unto death; but when he receives that seal, he is freed from death and assigned unto life. Now that seal

is the water of baptism, into which men go down under the obligation unto death, but come up appointed unto life. Wherefore, to those also was this seal preached, and they made use of it, that they might enter into the kingdom of God." He then asks the question, why those Apostles and teachers who are spiritually alive went down with them into the waters of baptism; to which he answers, "Because these Apostles and teachers who preached the name of the son of God, dying after they had received his faith and power, preached to them who were dead before, and they gave this seal to them.— They went down, therefore, into the water with them, and again came up. But these went down whilst they were *alive*, and came up again alive; whereas, those who were before dead, went down *dead*, but came up alive.— Through these, therefore, they received life, and knew the son of God: for which cause they *came up* with them, and *were fit* to come into the building of the tower; and were not cut, but put in entire. Because they died in righteousness and in great purity only, this seal was wanting to them—thus you have the explication of these things."

Thus far speaks Hermas, in the 16th chapter of his Similitudes—from which we learn that the *immersion of believers* was the only baptism taught and practised by St. Hermas. There is but one other reference to baptism in all this work, which is in a book called "the commands of St. Hermas." Command 4th, chap. 3, at the beginning, "And I said unto him, I have even now heard from certain teachers, that there is no other repentance besides that of baptism, when *we go down into the water*, and receive the forgiveness of sins, and that after that we should sin no more, but live in purity. And he said unto me, Thou hast been rightly informed."

Having now closely and repeatedly examined the two epistles of Clement to the Corinthians, the epistle of Polycarp to the Phillippians, the epistle of Ignatius to the Ephesians, the epistle of Ignatius to the Magnesians, his epistles to the Traillians, the Romans, the Philadelphians, the Smyrneans, and his epistle to Polycarp, together with the Catholic epistle of Barnabas, and the genuine works of St. Hermas, I can declare, that the above three extracts are the only passages in the above mentioned epistles, in which baptism is mentioned, and that these

are, agreeably to the decisions of the most learned Pedo-baptists as well as Baptists, the only genuine works of those fathers whose names they bear.* The testimonies of these epistles, say the Pedo-baptists themselves, are, together with the holy scriptures of the New Testament, a complete collection of the most primitive antiquity for 150 years after Christ." But in the mean time, while I attend to other ecclesiastical authorities, Mr. W. may peruse this precious fragment of antiquity.

I now proceed to consider the testimony of Justin Martyr. John P. Campbell, Mr. W's authority, has these words of Justin Martyr—"Several persons among us, of 60 and 70 years old, and of both sexes, who were disciplined or made disciples to Christ in their childhood, do continue uncorrupted." Now what fondness must possess the mind of a man to support infant baptism, who can attempt to deduce from the above words, a testimony in its favor! The suppositions on which such an attempt is predicated, are both false. It is taken for granted that childhood and infancy, in the common sense of the word, are expressive of the same idea—and it is also supposed, that to become a disciple is equivalent to be baptised. An infant disciple is a contradiction in terms. Many persons amongst ancient and modern baptists, have, at the age of 10 or 12 years, been baptised, upon a profession of their faith; and if any persons had spoken of them, they would have said such persons were made disciples, and baptised in their childhood.—A disciple is a learner, a scholar, a student, a follower.—To be made a disciple of Christ, implies faith in him as a prophet or teacher sent from God, which persuades the subject to put himself under his tuition. To think, or to say, that an infant is capable of this, shocks all common sense!

Justin, in his other works, says that "we are circumcised by baptism with Christ's circumcision"—"And we have received it by baptism, and it is enjoined to all persons to receive it in the same way." From these words, too, Mr. W. can discover a testimony in favor of infant

* Mr. Walker, though he had never seen the book before that day, was pleased, after reading a few sentences here and there, modestly to pronounce it spurious, though of great antiquity. I asked him on what grounds did he so insinuate against the testimony of the most honorable and learned vouchers for its authenticity—he could only say, that he thought so himself!

baptism. How eagle-eyed is a pedo-baptist, intent on maintaining his ground!—Because Justin Martyr says “that it is enjoined upon all persons to receive the import of circumcision in baptism, (which, by the bye, is an opinion of his own) *infants are enjoined to receive it too*”—and they are capable of hearkening to and obeying the injunction! There is not, then, I affirm, the slightest ground to quote Justin Martyr, as a testimony in favor of infant baptism; for such an idea is not to be found in all his works. It was such violent efforts as these, of Pedo-baptists, to maintain their cause, not only above, but contrary to, all reason, that first led me to suspect that it was a human invention. For strange as it may appear, the defences of infant baptism, and the defenders of it to which I had access, when investigating the subject, increased and deepened my convictions that it was a mere tradition of men.

Irenaeus is next summoned as evidence in favor of infant baptism; he is said to have flourished about the year 176. His “convincing” testimony in favor of infant baptism runs in these words—“Christ came to save all persons by himself; all, I say, who are regenerated unto God, infants, and little ones, and children, and youths, and elder persons.” Does this prove that Irenaeus speaks of infant baptism in his time? Where is it in his testimony? O! say the Pedo-baptists, John P. Campbell and Mr. Walker, “*regenerated unto God*” meant baptized, and as infants are said to have been regenerated, it means that they were baptized. Irenaeus never used the word baptized at all! He substituted regeneration for baptism. Let us then do, as my opponent, by his quotation, says we should do, viz: substitute *baptism* instead of *regeneration*, and then the testimony of Irenaeus thus reads—“Christ came to save all persons by himself; all, I say, who are baptized, infants, little ones, children, youths, and elder persons.” The testimony of Irenaeus then, as his commentators make it, is no way honorable to his sentiments as a Christian. Will my opponent say that all baptized persons are saved—infants, &c. &c. then is infant baptism worth contending for!—So it appears that, according to Irenaeus, Christ saves all baptized persons—and that the act of baptism was the act of regeneration! Perhaps some may think that I am offering violence to my opponent’s quotation; to prevent this I shall quote

Mr. Campbell's comment: "The phrase '*regenerated unto God*,' was, in the language of this father, and all other writers of that age, descriptive of the fact of *having been baptized*." "In no other sense did they ever use it." Then the testimony of Irenaeus stands as I have stated it, namely, "Christ came to save all baptized persons, infants, little ones, children, and elder persons. Two conclusions from this are inevitable: first—no baptism no salvation. And second, salvation to all the baptized. This, then, was the opinion, this the faith, of not only Irenaeus, but "of all other writers of that age." Certainly, then, it was a suitable age to institute infant baptism!—In shunning Scylla, Mr. W. you are wrecked on Charybdis.

Irenaeus suffered martyrdom in the year 202 or 203.—So that now, having travelled down the page of sacred and ecclesiastical history, for nearly 200 years, we never meet once with a word on infant baptism, nor a solitary example of one infant baptized. But we are now arriving at a proper time to expect its appearance. Whimsies and reveries are now becoming quite familiar; and Tertullian, the first writer that even mentions infant baptism, is about to make his appearance on the stage. Yes, Tertullian, the first of the Latin fathers, is the *first writer* that mentions infant baptism—though many pedit-baptists, have endeavoured to squeeze it out of Justin Martyr's and Irenaeus' words, they have utterly failed, and not one word can they find, until Tertullian appears, that they can bring to the test of criticism. This I am prepared to prove at much greater length than this opportunity will permit; but I am confident that what I have already suggested, is quite sufficient for the present purpose.

Before I dismiss Justin Martyr and his friend Irenaeus, I must introduce a few of the whimsies of these two renowned fathers, to prepare your minds for what we are about to read from Tertullian. Justin Martyr, like many of the Grecian converts, incorporated many of their Pagan notions with their Christian tenets. It is owing to this, that the Church of Rome, and some protestant Churches to this day, retain so much of Judaism and Pagan Philosophy. The following are a few of the reveries of Justin Martyr, that are found in his works—"That the just, after the resurrection, shall remain for a 1000 years in the city of Jerusalem, where they shall enjoy all

lawful pleasures—that the souls of the wicked shall become capable of dying, though at some times he thought their punishment would be eternal. He thought that the souls of the righteous, before the coming of Christ, were under the power of the Devil—that the Devils were ignorant of their damnation until the coming of Christ. He despaired not of the salvation of those who lived virtuously among the Gentiles, who had not the knowledge of Jesus Christ.” Such were some of the notions of this eminent father, in the most of which Irenaeus concurred with him. Irenaeus had, however, a few more eccentric opinions, as he was a few years later. In addition to those mentioned, “he imagined that Christ lived 50 years on earth, and that after death he went down to hell, and preached *the faith* there unto the patriarchs and to the ancient just men, as well Jews as Gentiles; and that they that believed at his preaching, should be reckoned in the number of his saints. He imagined also, that the angels were corporeal and that God sent Enoch to them.* That souls are immortal, only, through grace, and that the souls of men will assume the form of their bodies.”

These are the men who are so often called the successors of the Apostles, or of their immediate successors. I have to ask but one question on these data—I shall leave you to think of it, viz. Suppose these very men, themselves, had taught and practised infant baptism, (which, however, with all their errors they did not) would it have been further from the doctrine taught in the New Testament, than the notions they entertained; and how much is their testimony worth, upon any doctrinal subject, not clearly revealed in the New Testament?

I come now to hearken to Tertullian, and I will frankly own he mentions infant baptism. Whether boys or babes, is, however, controverted; but with this dispute I shall not intermeddle—Tertullian flourished from the year 194 till 216, he is ranked among the writers of the third century. From the quotation read out of Mr. J. P. Campbell, it is obvious he was no friend of infant baptism, though he has the honor of first mentioning it in history, sacred or

* See the following works of Justin—his Dialogue, pages 223, 306. See his Apology, page 71; 2d Apology, page 83. Irenaeus' works lib. 2, c. 51, 59, 61, 64—lib. 3, c. 18, 20; lib. 4, chap. 78; lib. 1, c. 40; lib. 4, c. 30. See, also, Eusebius and Du Pin on the lives of Justin and Irenaeus.

ecclesiastical—he appears like one opposing an innovation of recent date, not an established custom. As soon as we hear of infant baptism, so soon do we hear of God-fathers—they seem to be coetaneous. As soon as men depart from the scripture in one respect, they must depart from it in others, to make out their system. His words are—“what necessity is there, to expose God-fathers to answering for those at *the fonts*—(not at *the bason* as our modern paido-baptists would say)—since they may be prevented by death from being able to perform the promises which they have made for the children.”

Again, he says, “that they should come to baptism, as soon as they are advanced in years, as soon as they *have learnt their religion*, when they may be taught whither they are going, when *they are become Christians*, when they began to be able to know Jesus Christ. What is there that should compel this innocent age to receive baptism?” Who will not perceive, from these words of Tertullian, without any comment, that he was inimical to infant baptism, at its first appearance. Mr. Campbell, in commenting on this testimony, endeavours to shew that it was orphan children Tertullian had in view, but this will not stand the test, seeing he speaks of infants as such, and not a particular class of infants. Infant baptism, when it first made its appearance, had an epithet attached to it which Presbyterians have, by some strange revolution, lost; it was *sponsor infant baptism* Tertullian spoke of; he knew of no other; nay, it is obvious, from the above quotation, that he could not conceive of any other—for his first remonstrance against infant baptism, was the risk to which it exposed the sponsor or God-father. As it was sponsor infant baptism Tertullian wrote of, I cannot see, with what consistency, any body of Presbyterians can quote him in defence of their *sponsorless* infant baptism. The Romanists and Episcopalians might, with more propriety, quote Tertullian, had it not been that Tertullian spoke of *fonts* for immersion; and now all that a Roman Chapel or an Episcopalian Church can afford, in this dry and parched land, is a bason, and that often not deep enough to baptize one’s fingers. Sponsors and infant baptism have the same divine authority to sanction them, that is, not any; they have the same antiquity—that is Tertullian’s age; and the same ecclesiastical authority, that is the testimony of Tertullian and his successors. They

are united in their origin, in their youth, they were married in the prime of life, and it is cruel to divorce and separate them in their old days.

The philosophical cause of sponsors appears to have been this. It was plain to all, that faith was required in order to baptism, as instituted in the New Testament.—As soon as men first thought of extending it to infants, the absence of faith in the infants was a difficulty, which they set about surmounting in the best possible manner—some ingenious person suggested the scheme of having faith by proxy, that is some person profess faith, answer questions, and vow resolutions for the infant—the idea struck—the plan was approved, and God-fathers multiplied, not merely in the same ratio of the infants, for some of them had a hundred God-fathers. The rich had many, and the poor, who are ever on the back ground, had but few. The meaning and use of these proxies or securities, will be better understood by the following questions and answers. What is your name?—*Ans.* John Zealous—Who gave you this name? *Ans.* my God-fathers and God-mothers in my baptism, wherein I was made a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of Heaven. What did your God-fathers and God-mothers then for you? *Ans.* They did promise and vow three things in my name; first, that I should renounce the Devil and all his works, the pomps and vanities of this wicked world, and all the sinful lusts of the flesh: second, that I should believe all the articles of the Christian faith: third, that I should keep God's holy will and commandments, and walk in the same to my life's end." If infant baptism and God-mothers, can secure all this, they are worth contending for! Such is the practice of the Church of England, which professes to stand upon the holy scriptures, and the first four general councils; leaving all the other holy and learned councils of antiquity to whosoever pleases to adopt them.

But I have another testimony of Tertullian to read, which I hope will be heard with all the impartiality you can command. It accounts for more than the origin of infant baptism, it is doubtless one of the best authenticated testimonies of antiquity—It is in the following words—De Corona Militis as quoted by Du Pin, page 92, vol. 1st. "To begin, says he, with baptism, when we are ready to enter into the water, and even before we make our pro-

testations before the bishop, and in the church; that we renounce the Devil, and all his pomps and ministers; afterwards we are plunged in the water three times, and they make us answer to some things which are not precisely set down in the Gospel; after that they make us taste milk and honey and we bathe ourselves every day during the whole week. We receive the sacrament of the Eucharist instituted by Jesus Christ, when we eat, and in the morning assemblies, and we do not receive it but from the hands of those that preside there. We offer yearly oblations for the dead in honor of the martyrs. We believe, that it is not lawful to fast on Sundays, and to pray to God kneeling. From Easter to Whitsuntide we enjoy the same privilege. We take great care not to suffer any part of the wine and consecrated bread to fall to the ground.—We often sign ourselves with the sign of the cross. If you demand a law for these practises, taken from the scriptures, *we cannot find one there*, but we must answer—that 'tis tradition that has established them, custom that has authorised them, and faith (superstition) that has made them to be observed."

So testifies Tertullian, an advocate for tradition. So speaks this great hero of pedo-baptists, who has the honor of first recording the practice—such was the profile of Christianity in the year 216—such was the soil, such the climate that produced the luxuriant tradition of infant baptism. Not an ordinance of Christ remained pure and uncorrupted in the days of Tertullian—Innovations had corrupted baptism, the Eucharist, prayer, fasting and the Lord's day. The above testimony establishes and confirms this declaration. But this was not all; new institutes or traditions were incorporated with the remains of primitive Christianity, and the Christian Church exhibited an unnatural, irrational & unscriptural appearance. I need not repeat the testimony I have just now quoted, I need not again tell you of the superstition and wild eccentricities of the close of the second, and beginning of the third century. But what is most to be deplored in the history of the era of infant baptism, is, that tradition itself, as a proper source of instruction, and as a rule of faith and practice, was defended and supported by such men as this famous Latin father. I consider it of no consequence who acknowledged and maintained infant baptism after this time. Were it not for reasons unconnected with the

merits of this debate, I should never dispute, with my opponent, nor with any other man, respecting the decrees of St. Cyprian and his 66 Bishops, or the testimony of Origen, Augustine, Pelagius, &c.; when in the days of Tertullian, traditions, the most palpably absurd and extravagant, were viewed as tantamount to scripture authority; what may we expect to find one or two hundred years after! Yes, my friends, I may say in relation to you, as the Queen of Sheba once said in relation to herself: "The one half has not been told you." Before I dismiss this part of the subject, I will lead you back to take a second view of the 1st and 2d centuries. In the mean time, when you hear of the antiquity of infant baptism, or any other religious practice, not taught in the Bible, remember the declaration of the venerable Tertullian. "If you demand a law for these practices, taken from the scriptures, *we cannot find one there*, but we must answer, that 'tis *tradition* that has established them, *custom* that has authorized them, and *faith* that has made them to be observed." With regard to infant baptism, the above is as true, in my opinion, as that Adam and Eve were the parents of us all.

When we hear a paidobaptist referring to church history to prove his practice, when we hear him talking of the successors of the Apostles; of the purity, the doctrinal precision of those men, and their extraordinary attainments and advantages, we would be almost persuaded to consider them little Apostles, and their writings almost canonical.

The most orthodox of the fathers were full of wild notions and extravagant fancies that would dishonor the lowest grade of Christians amongst us. Many of them were no doubt good men and faithful witnesses of facts; but they held many puerile opinions. Tertullian himself, a great writer, and distinguished amongst the Latin Fathers, as one of the most renowned champions of Christianity, held many foolish and absurd opinions, such as, that the soul is corporeal, that it takes a certain form of the body, that it is generated thus: the body of the parents generates a body, and the soul of the parent generates a soul; that the souls of all after death are disposed of in a certain subterraneous place, where they receive refreshment and torment, according to the *good* or *evil* they have done; that the soul and breath are the same in many respects;

that every soul has its dæmon;* of baptism he said, "that the external application of water to the body, in a miraculous manner took away all the stains of sin from the soul; and that when that stain is taken away the punishment is remitted unto us." "That the body should be anointed with oil after baptism, and hands imposed to induce the holy spirit to descend. That as John prepared the way of the Lord, so the Angel that presided over the baptism of men, prepares the way of the Holy Ghost;" with many other things of a similar nature.

From his "book on penance," I will transcribe a few words and dismiss this worthy Father. "I confess, says he, that God grants remission of sins to those who receive baptism, but they must take pains to be made worthy of it, for who would be so bold as to confer this sacrament on a person, of whose repentance he has any reason to make a doubt. You may impose upon the minister, and so procure baptism by false pretences; but God, who knows the heart, keeps his own treasures to himself, and does not grant his grace, but only to those that are worthy of it; so that none can imagine that he may sin more freely, because being yet but a Catechumen, he shall receive the remission of his sins in baptism; for this sacrament is *the seal of faith*, and repentance is the beginning and stamp of faith. Lastly, we are not washed from our pollutions by baptism, only that we might sin no more, but because we have our heart already purified."—*Quia jam corde loti sumus.*" To those who sinned after baptism, he allowed there was but one repentance—that he called "the second repentance, which is the last hope that remains to those who have committed any crimes, that is enormous sins, after baptism. God, however, foreseeing man's infirmities and the Devil's temptations, was willing that though the gate of remission was shut and the grace of baptism refused forever to those who had forfeited their baptismal innocence, they should have yet one remedy left, which is a second repentance; but that it is granted unto them but once." He then proceeds to describe this public penance called *Exomologesis*—"Tis an exercise to abase the sinner, it makes him lie in sackcloth and upon ashes, entirely to neglect his body, it overwhelms his mind with grief

* See his book on the Soul, written against the Platonists, Pythagonians and Heretics, as also Du Pin, page 90, vol. 1.

and sorrow; it reduces him to drink nothing but *water*, and to eat nothing but *bread*; and to take no more than what is necessary for his sustenance; it obliges him to prolong his prayers, and to feed them by fastings: it causes him to break out in sighs and groans and tears, to cry day and night to the Lord, and to cast himself at the priest's feet, and to prostrate himself before God's favorites; to conjure all his brethren to pray for him, and to appease the wrath of God by their prayers." So much for Tertullian and his Exomologesis. You that look up to antiquity, you that venerate the fathers; study and practice this venerable prescription, and remember that this Exomologesis is as apostolical, and as venerable, more ancient, and more approved by Tertullian, than infant baptism. Hitherto we have discoursed of the lights of the first and second centuries, and excepting those whose testimonies are bound up in the New Testament, we have seen that there are too many dark spots in the brightest of them to constitute them truly luminous bodies. But besides these, there was a host of deluded creatures that had no light in them. They emitted a false glare, only to bewilder and deceive the ignorant and unwary. Their followers resembled the benighted traveller lured from the path of safety, by the illusive glimmerings of an ignis-fatuus.

In the two first centuries, errors, heresies, and heretics, increased in an alarming ratio. The Christian church seemed to be almost deluged with error, and book after book was written on both sides of each question, which rather augmented than diminished the errors of the day. I shall simply mention the names of some of the different sects, that warred against what we would call the most orthodox party, from the days of the Apostle John till Tertullian's time, but little more than an interval of 100 years. These were the Nicolaitans, the Ebionites, the Corinthians, the Nazarenes (not those first called the Nazarenes,) the Marcionites, the Gnostics, the Valentinians, the Marcellians, the Montanists, the Bardesanites, the Basilidians, the Simonians, and the Carpocratians, &c. &c. These all flourished either previous to, or in the time of Tertullian. You will, no doubt, agree with me, that the Devil was as busy in those days as in any subsequent period—and that it is no way surprizing that in such a flood of error, infant baptism might begin to appear in the beginning of the third century.

Infant baptism very naturally grew out of the doctrines which obtained even amongst the most orthodox. To support and illustrate this, I have but to attend to the testimonies that have been adduced from the fathers, quoted in favor of infant baptism. The proposition which is necessary to establish this, is the following, viz. *‘That it was the belief of the orthodox, that baptism washed away all the guilt of the subject, whether imputed, or contracted by actual transgression.’* This opinion constrained Tertullian to admit the baptism of infants, to use his own words, “in cases of urgent necessity,” though he opposed the common and universal baptism of infants. These cases of urgent necessity were those which threatened the immediate death of the minor or infant; and, in order to wash away its guilt previous to death, Tertullian and others, his immediate successors, admitted them to baptism. If, then, I can shew that this notion prevailed in those times, and in the times immediately succeeding, I have gained all that is necessary to account for the origination of infant baptism. The counterpart of the above proposition is—*‘that sins committed after baptism were almost, if not altogether impardonable.’* This opinion operated very much against the practice of infant baptism, except in “the cases of urgent necessity,” and it even operated against the immediate baptism of believers. “Hence virgins,” “young men,” and “young widows,” were dissuaded, by Tertullian, from this ordinance, until they had arrived at a state of confirmed continency.”—Hence we read of Constantine and many others deferring baptism until they came to their death-bed, least they should sin after it. I mention these two opinions as prevailing in those days, and as having a powerful bearing on the doctrine and practice of baptism. Tertullian has confessed the one and the other of these opinions.

Origen, the most famous of the fathers for the multiplicity and variety of his works, flourished from the year 215 till 252. His views of infant baptism, and of the use of baptism, have been given in the extracts made by Mr. W. from Mr. Campbell, from which I will quote one sentence declarative of his views of the import of baptism—“None is free from pollution, though his life be but the length of one day upon the earth, and it is for that reason *because, by the sacrament of baptism, the pollutions of our birth are taken away*, that infants are baptised.”—Origen’s testi-

mony to infant baptism, as quoted by my opponent, equally proves that he viewed baptism as purgative of all previous guilt. Why, then, does not Mr. W. teach and hold infant baptism in the same light, as the authorities he quotes in support of it?

Cyprian's testimony exhibits the same views of baptism; his words are, or rather the decision of the 66 bishops is, "that, if from baptism and grace no person is to be excluded, by how much the more should the infant be exempt from prohibition, who being but just born, has never sinned, otherwise than as sprung by a carnal birth from Adam, he has contracted, in the earliest moments of his nativity, the contagion of death originally threatened; and who, for this very reason, attains more easily the remission of sins, because they are not his own, but others' sins that are remitted unto him."—He adds, in the conclusion of his letter to Fidus—"Therefore, very dear brother, this has been our decision in council, that from baptism and the grace of God, who is merciful and benign and affectionate to all, no person is to be prohibited by us." What need have we of further witness? If Tertullian, Origen, St. Cyprian, and the 66 bishops, the council of Carthage, have all believed and determined that baptism washes away all sins, and renders infants pure and innocent as Adam before he sinned, is it to be marvelled at, that they first thought of applying it to infants? Nay, verily, for who would be so cruel as to prohibit a dying infant, or even one that might die, from the remission of all its sins, from a little scrupulosity of conscience!

Although enough has been said to establish the proposition already stated, I will, to gratify the curiosity of some, present Augustine's explanation of this mystery—It is in these words: "And as the thief, who by necessity went without baptism, was saved, because by his piety he had it spiritually: so where baptism is had, though the party, by necessity go without *that faith* which the thief had, *yet he is saved.*" This, says he, "the whole body of the church holds as delivered to them (from the council of Carthage) in the case of little infants baptised." So, then, the faith of *all* the first advocates of infant baptism is briefly expressed in these words—"As the thief *by faith*, without baptism, was saved, so all infants *by baptism*, without faith are saved." Such are the testimonies quoted by the paidobaptists themselves, in support of their practice!!!

I am now authorised to say that infant baptism originated in the above mistakes of the true nature and use of baptism—that infant baptism is, and was, the natural and obvious consequence of the aforementioned perversion of a sacred ordinance—I challenge all Christendom to disprove it.

That which for some time retarded the prevalence of infant baptism, and in thousands of instances altogether prevented it, was the counterpart of the aforesaid proposition, viz. that sins committed after baptism were almost impardonable. This opinion operated against the practice of the former, as action and re-action in mechanics destroy each other. But, as the opinion of the difficulty of obtaining remission of sins after baptism declined, the practice became the more general.

This idea also led to the introduction of sprinkling instead of immersion; for as many who had postponed baptism until a sick-bed, could not then endure the difficulties of transportation to some suitable place, or even the action of immersion itself; they were obliged to substitute pouring or sprinkling in lieu of baptism. This I will prove from Eusebius, when we come to discuss the action or mode of baptism.

I come now to read some extracts from a certain historian, on the character and writings of some of those fathers, whose testimonies you have heard. Hitherto, I have exhibited my own sentiments on the testimonies adduced, and I have admitted more than many eminent men have admitted from church history, in favor of the antiquity of infant baptism. For this author which I now hold in my hand, an eminent historian, will not admit that infant baptism was spoken of by Tertullian and Origen, in our sense of the word *infant*. He dates the origin of infant baptism half a century later than I have done—and argues that the infants of Tertullian were *boys*, or infants in law. This he ably supports by many plain and convincing reasons. In the present debate I suppose it most expedient to admit the quotations, as read by my opponent, and answer them as genuine, in their own meaning of the words, feeling the greatest assurance that those very testimonies carried their own refutation in them, in as far as the establishment of the question at issue is concerned—and indeed the difference of a few years in fixing the era of infant baptism, or of a

few years in the age of the infant subject, destitute of faith; appears to me unworthy of any elaborate discussion. This author makes the practice of infant baptism to commence with St. Cyprian and his associate bishops.

[Here I was asked the name of the author I held in my hand, by Mr. Findley, I replied that his name was Robert Robinson. Mr. Findley objected to my reading any thing from Robinson, a man that had spoken disrespectfully of the Saint Cyprian. I replied, that I considered Mr. Findley's interference, *partial*: that I had not objected to Mr. Walker's reading any thing he pleased to bring forward, knowing that I could easily refute it; and, that I had not even asked the name of the author he had just now read. Mr. F. still insisted that it should not be read, because Mr. Robinson had traduced characters that he deemed sacred: I replied that I knew of no characters *so sacred* since the Apostles died, but that might be scrutinized, when necessary; that I considered my own character as *sacred* as that of *St. Cyprian*, and that I would submit to investigation when it became necessary for any important purpose—that from a supposed sanctity of character, we should not fear to investigate the character of any man, whose testimony we were about to receive in relation to an ancient religious custom: but, continued I, I feel no necessity for the testimony of Mr. Robinson or any other man, in aid of the cause which I espouse, it was merely to edify the congregation I wished to bring him forward as an offset to balance John P. Campbell's book, which Mr. W. has just now read. Here there was a cry though the congregation, "*read—read.*" I moved that it should be left to the congregation to decide whether the book should or should not be read. Mr. Findley then harangued the congregation for several minutes, and wound up his observations by saying, "all that are determined to have the character of the Saints, now dead, traduced—vote for having Robinson read." I immediately replied, that was *not* the question. The question is, shall I read? or shall I not read? The question first proposed was, *shall I read?* then when the vote was taken by uplifted hands—the question *shall I not read?* was proposed; an overwhelming majority being in favor of hearing Mr. Robinson—I proceeded to read.]

[I cannot now transcribe all that I read from Mr. Robinson, on the following accounts: First, because I have,

under this article of the debate, already advanced more than I spoke on this part of the subject. The reason of my so doing I will now submit to the good sense and candor of the reader. I had not read much from Mr. Robinson until my forty minutes were expired; I plead to have the twenty minutes of my time that was occupied in debating whether or not Robinson should be read, then allowed me, to go on with the subject. Mr. Findley utterly refused to grant this. I then thought it was unjust, as he had prevented me from applying them as I thought proper. I think so still, and therefore I have taken them *now*, in recording what I ought *then* to have said. In the next place, Robinson is so common an author, and so generally possessed by the citizens of this country, that the reader anxious to peruse his whole work for himself, may easily obtain an opportunity of so doing. In the last place, I had intended to have an article on the argument from ecclesiastical history in the appendix, but having gone so far into the merits of it now, I shall attempt to close this part of the subject with a short quotation from Robinson and a few general observations. The reader will pardon this long digression.]

I shall not now transcribe the censures that Robinson has pronounced on any of Mr. Findley's saints, I shall merely transcribe a part of his account of the council of Carthage, called by St. Cyprian, A. D. 257. Mr. Robinson's words are, page 188 Benedict's edition: "The council of 60 or 70 met. The solemn affairs came on. One was this. There was a bishop named Rogatian, who had in his church a contumelious deacon, against whom Rogatian complained that he treated him his bishop with contumacy, that is, disobedience. Nothing else was laid to his charge except that he was a younger man than his bishop. St. Cyprian took the opinions of his colleagues as learned in the law as himself, and wrote for answer to Rogatian: 'That the council was extremely shocked at the contents of his letter, which informed them that his deacon had treated him with contumacy: that he himself had power to vindicate the dignity of his office, by excommunicating such a refractory man; though in his great humility he had applied to his brother bishops in his council. God himself had decided the case in the 17th chap. of Deuteronomy, by saying the man that will do presumptuously, and will not hearken to the priest, that man shall die. And

all the people shall hear and fear, and do no more presumptuously. This was the sin of Corah, Dathan, and Abiram. It was for this, God said to Samuel, 'they have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me.' If Paul said, 'let no man despise thy youth,' how much more may we say, let no man despise thine old age. This is the spring of all heresies and schisms. Deacons ought to recollect that the Lord Jesus himself elected Apostles, that is bishops; but as for deacons, they were instituted after the death of Jesus only by his Apostles. This deacon ought, therefore, to repent, and give the bishop full satisfaction; and if not, he ought to be excommunicated. If others encourage and imitate him, they should be treated in the same manner. Farewell, brother."—The second cause tried before the court was this: a Christian man, it should seem a bishop, named Geminus Victor, had departed this life, and by will, duly executed, had appointed his brother Geminus Faustinus, a preaching elder, executor of his will, and guardian of his children. This was an heinous crime in the eyes of the fathers. For a man to presume to employ the clergy in secular affairs, when God had appointed them as the tribe of Levi, to exercise themselves in divine things, and had commanded all other men to cultivate the earth and follow businesses, and to support the Lord's priests with the tenth of their labors, was a great crime and a dangerous precedent. It was ordered that the dead man's name should be struck out of the diptychs: and that such as in future should imitate his example, and employ the clergy to do any secular business, should be excommunicated.

Lastly comes the question about infant baptism. The letter written by Fidus was read, but as it is lost, a judgment of it can only be formed by what Cyprian has said of it. It is not known who Fidus was. The precise question before the association was, At what age may infants be baptized? Fidus thought at eight days, because the law of circumcision prescribed this time. "No," replied the council, "God denies his grace to none; Jesus Christ came not to destroy men's lives but to save them—and we ought to do all we can to save our fellow creatures;" "besides," added they, "God would be a respecter of persons, if he denied to infants what he grants to adults. Did not the prophet Elisha lay upon a child, and put his mouth upon his mouth, and his eyes

upon his eyes, and his hands upon his hands? Now the spiritual sense of this is, that infants are equal to men: but if you refuse to baptise them, you destroy this equality, and are partial."

Fidus had a second difficulty stronger than the first. It was the custom to kiss the person newly baptised; but he informed the council in his letter, that children were reputed unclean the first seven days, and therefore people did not choose to kiss them. This was an article of great consequence. The Fathers answered—"You are mistaken, Fidus, children in this case are not unclean, for the Apostles saith, 'to the pure all things are pure.' No man ought to be shocked at kissing what God condescends to create. Circumcision was a carnal rite, this is spiritual circumcision, and Peter saith we ought not to call any man common or unclean."

Such was the council of Carthage, that decreed the baptising of new born infants. To comment on the wisdom or folly of this council, exhibited in the three articles on which they decided, would be as needless as to begin to describe darkness to a man confined in the darkest cells. This council of Carthage, in its grand characteristics, may be compared to the first councils held under bishop Victor, to adjust the celebrated controversy about keeping Easter. The bishops of Asia, according to their ancient custom, always celebrated Easter on the 14th of the moon of March, on whatever day it happened: whereas, the western churches waited for the Lord's day before they observed it. This controversy had well nigh rent the Catholic church; and was finally decided in the councils under Victor, A. D. 192, that they should forbear with one another. Thus have we explored the merits of infant baptism as to its claims on early apostolical institutions.—And now we may say, as an eminent Presbyterian minister said in Scotland, in respect of his brethren, the clergy—"If," said he, "you would see the *nakedness* of the clergy, you must frequent their presbyteries and synods"—so we say—"If you would see the *nakedness* of infant baptism, you must read the history of the second and third centuries of the church."

Some have considered it very strange and unprecedented, that men could so soon depart from the genuine institutes of christianity, as that in an 150, or two hundred years, to have admitted of infant baptism. This is

by no means so surprising as at first sight it may appear, when we consider how soon even political institutions, to which men are much more alive, are infringed, metamorphosed, and set aside, in the lapse of even 50 years. Do we not, in the public prints of every day, read complaints of the departure of our fellow citizens from the spirit and letter of our great Magna Charta? Whence has arisen the schismatic discriminations of Washingtonians, Federal and Democratic Republicans, Old school and New school, in the lapse of 40 years; even while the blood yet circulates through the heads, and hearts, of some of those men, who framed the political institutes of our country? When we consider the multiplicity of public prints, the endless variety of articles every day exhibited on these topics; and reflect, that in the first centuries there was only a few manuscript copies of any works then published, and these in the hands of a very few, we will not consider it at all a marvellous thing that Pelagius and others in the 4th century, should say they never heard that baptism was denied to infants.

The infant baptism of the first centuries that practiced it, was essentially different from the infant baptism of modern times. The infant baptism of those who introduced and first taught it, was, a baptism that washed away all previous guilt: it was in fact a purgatorial rite. This every one of the authors quoted from antiquity by the paidobaptists abundantly prove, as I have already shewn. The care of those who instructed the Catechumens to prevent them from licentiousness, was predicated on this presumption. They feared that the Catechumens, under the impression of receiving absolution in baptism, would indulge in sins to an excess that otherwise they would not have done, had they not expected pardon in baptism. Even the baptism of believers they had so far perverted, as to make it purgative of all sins before committed. It is a sophism in reasoning, of the most dangerous tendency, to change the terms, or to use them in different senses, so as to quote them in one sense, and apply them in another. For instance, suppose a man should tell a fellow citizen whom he had employed to work in his vineyard, that he would pay him the same amount per day, that was paid to those labourers, in the vineyard of the parable, in the New Testament, viz. a penny. Suppose, then, in the evening of the day, he should pay him a penny, and

that the receiver should object, saying, you promised me the same amount as the Jewish labourers in the parable obtained—I have done it, says the employer, I gave you a penny, and they got no more—Aye, replies the labourer, but a penny in England is only the seventh part of a Roman penny, and a penny in America, is but the 10th part of a Roman penny. I have paid you a penny, replies the employer—Nay but, replies the labourer, I have received but the tenth part of what you promised. So might any baptised infant, after baptism, say to the priest, (if it could talk) you have not given me the tenth part of what you promised me, according to the meaning of those who first taught and practised infant baptism, and whom you profess to follow. The views of those who now practice this rite are, we trust, essentially distinct from the views of the ancient paidobaptists. It is, then, doing their own cause an irreparable injury, to quote any authority from the first fifteen centuries in support of their practice. Such quotations are either irrelevant, or their views of baptism are the same. They should know that the church of Rome declares, no baptism no salvation; and refuses burial, in consecrated grave yards, to unbaptised persons. Hence they commissioned midwives to baptise or sprinkle such infants as they supposed would die immediately after birth. Now the Roman church quotes Tertullian, Origen, Augustine, &c. &c. in support of their practice; and as the protestant part of Christendom quotes the same authorities, they must either act the most inconsistent part, or they must agree with the church of Rome, in their views of infant baptism.

The church of Scotland refuses to admit tradition as a ground of faith and practice; how any of her members, then, can plead for a rite altogether founded on tradition, never once mentioned in the Bible, appears to me at least a gross dereliction of principle.—

MY CONVICTION IS, THAT NOTHING IS TO BE ADMITTED INTO THE FAITH, DOCTRINE, OR DISCIPLINE, OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH, THAT IS NOT AS OLD AS THE NEW TESTAMENT; NAY THAT IS NOT EXPRESSLY REVEALED IN THE BIBLE: I SHALL EVER BE GRATEFUL TO THE MAN THAT POINTS OUT ANY DANGEROUS TENDENCY IN THIS PRINCIPLE.

So stood the debate at 2 o'clock on Tuesday. We adjourned for half an hour; and on commencement, the action of baptism, commonly called the *mode*, became the theme of discussion. Mr. Findley, at the instance of Mr. Walker, wished to limit us to once speaking on each side. At this motion I felt surprized, coming from those who, in the morning of that day, proposed adjourning from day to day until every thing should be fully discussed. I consented to speaking twice on each side, on the ground that if it was sufficient for them it was quite sufficient for me.

Mr. W. then began :

I contend that pouring or sprinkling are scriptural modes of baptism; as much so as immersion or dipping. But the baptists maintain that nothing is baptism but dipping, and that if a person is not completely plunged in water, he is not baptised; nay, if one hair of his head is out of the water, he is not baptised. We have, at least, more charity than they, for we admit that their baptism by immersion is right, but it is not the only mode; but they have no charity for us, for they declare that sprinkling or pouring is no baptism. Mr. C. has brought a whole "bundle of Greek" with him; I suppose he intends to use it to prove immersion to be the only mode. He may require all this Greek to prove his point; but I will stick to my Bible—I find in it that evidence which is sufficient to justify my conduct. The scriptures teach me that baptism has a respect to the blood of sprinkling that justifies us, and it is very suitable to administer baptism in such a way as that this reference may be seen. Again, were not almost all the uses of blood under the law by means of sprinkling? Moses sprinkled all the people with blood, the book of the law, and almost all the vessels of the sanctuary. In view of this, the ancient prophet said, "so shall he sprinkle many nations," thereby intimating, that the Gentiles, converted by the Gospel, would be sprinkled, *not* dipped. Again, we profess to believe that a few drops of Christ's blood, nay that one drop of it, is sufficient to justify us. Why, then, should we act in any way contrary to our faith, in baptizing, so as to indicate that it was the quantity, not the quality, that relieved our souls, or affected our state? It must also be admitted, that a few drops of water sprinkled upon the face, are

a clearer emblem of the atoning blood of Christ, than the total immersion of the body in water. Besides, there is as much virtue in a few drops of water, as there is in the largest quantity. And if we suppose baptism to have a reference to the conferring of the spirit of God, immersion is not a suitable emblem of it, but pouring is very expressive of it. So that all the things signified by baptism, are better illustrated & exhibited by sprinkling than by dipping.

The phrase "*en udati*," so often quoted by the baptists, to shew that baptism was performed in water, is capable of being rendered *with* water. Thus *en* is translated, Luke 14, 31, "He that cometh (*en*) with ten thousand"—indeed, *en* is often translated by sundry words besides *in*, such as *by*, *with*, *through*, *towards*, &c. And even where it is translated *in*, it does not always signify immersed or enveloped with that in relation to which it is used. Thus in John, first chapter, we read, John was *in* the wilderness—these things were done *in* Bethabara—the light shineth *in* the darkness: now we are not to suppose that John was immersed in the wilderness, or that those miracles were enveloped in Bethabara.

Again: the word "*baptizo*," which is commonly translated baptise, does not necessarily signify to dip, but to sprinkle or pour. This I will prove from the usage of the word in the New Testament—it is said, Luke 11, 67, "A certain Pharisee asked Jesus to dine with him; and he went in and sat down to meat. And when the Pharisee saw it, he marvelled that he had not first *washed* before dinner." Now certainly it was not his whole body, but his hands, that is intended here; and we know, that a man's hands is washed by sprinkling water or pouring water upon them. Thus Elisha poured water upon the hands of Elijah. Again, the Jewish sprinklings, and there were not a few of them, were called *baptisms*.—The Apostle, in the ninth chapter of his Epistle to the Hebrews, 10th verse, says, "It stood only in meats and drinks, and diverse washings," (*baptisms*.) Even "*bapto*" itself, which is the root of *baptizo*, sometimes signifies to sprinkle—thus Nebuchadnezzar's body was wet with the dew of Heaven, Daniel 4th, 33d, & 5th, 21st; here the term *bapto* is applied, when only sprinkling could be intended, for, certainly, Nebuchadnezzar's body was not immersed in the dew. Now as it is agreed that the words *bapto* and *baptizo* signify to wash, the only thing to con-

tend for is, how is the water to be applied in washing, whether by sprinkling or pouring, or by dipping, the thing washed in water. The above texts shew that it was by sprinkling, and not by dipping. Again, the meaning of the ordinance of baptism, as explained in many passages, fully shews that this is the true meaning of the word—thus, “be baptised for the remission of sins, be baptised and wash away your sins, the blood of Christ cleanseth us from all sin, but ye are washed, but ye are justified;” now how is this washing performed, “by the blood of sprinkling”—“your hearts are sprinkled from a guilty conscience.” So that the meaning of the word, and the meaning of the ordinance, concur in establishing the point, that sprinkling is the true mode of baptism. I know Mr. C. is anxious to get at this huge pile of Greek—you will no doubt be much entertained with it—he may now proceed.

I then rejoined :

Mr. W. has inveighed no little against these Greek authorities which lie before us. Though I am not surprised at this, when I consider what they contain, yet I cannot but remark, that his complaints are very unreasonable. Who has rendered an appeal to the original languages necessary? Most assuredly not the baptists: they are content with the present version, in so far as the merits of this question is concerned; at least they are willing to abide by it alone. They can see their practice clearly sanctioned by it, and not a word can they see in it, concerning the sprinkling of infants or adults. If, then, the Pedo-baptists will abide by it, and admit it as evidence in this and every such investigation, we shall have no occasion for this “pile of Greek.” But this they have not hitherto done, and it is to be feared that they will not consent to it. How often, when a plain unlettered baptist reasons with some “learned divine,” or “wise layman,” is he told of his incapacity to argue on baptism, because of his want of erudition. Oft, when the unassuming English reader of the New Testament tells the “profound linguist” of their being baptised in rivers, of their going down into the water, and of their coming up out of the water, he is modestly told, that if he understood Greek he would know better, for the Greek Testament made it plain that they were only baptised of or

near to, rivers; and that going down into, only meant going down "towards" the water; and that coming up out of, only meant, "in Greek," coming from the edge of the water. It is the Pede-baptists that render this appeal necessary; and therefore it is, that it comes with so bad a grace from Mr. W. to speak against an appeal, which his own cause and party have rendered necessary. But I repeat it again, that the English New Testament sufficiently shews us that a believer is the only proper subject, and that the only baptism of divine authority is immersion. An appeal to the original, however, very much strengthens our cause, for in fact our faith and practice on this subject, is much more plainly sanctioned from the Greek New Testament than from the English version of it. I am always led to suspect that a man's acquaintance with Greek is very superficial, or his prejudices very strong, when he attempts to justify the custom of sprinkling infants by Greek criticism.

As my opponent has broken the way into Greek criticism, I shall attempt to follow him; I shall only premise one thing concerning the authorities which I am about to quote, which is, that they were the most eminent scholars and confessedly the greatest masters of the Greek language, which modern Europe has produced; and, what is not a little remarkable, they were pede-baptists; consequently, their testimony cannot be suspected of any partiality to the cause I advocate. I shall begin with Dr. George Campbell, Professor of Greek in the college of Aberdeen, who is the boast of the Athens of Europe, and the most distinguished luminary in the Greek tongue, in the Presbyterian Church of Scotland. He was a pede-baptist, because he considered the sprinkling of infants a matter of indifference as a religious custom that had obtained in the Presbyterian Church without scripture authority, which he found himself, from some causes of expediency, inclined to support; at the same time, he is so candid as to tell them the plain truth, with regard to the true meaning of those terms and phrases, which are so often quoted by them, in support of their practice. With regard to the scripture form of Church government, as far as that was to be ascertained, either from a knowledge of the ancient languages, or from ecclesiastical history, they argued that it was *independent*, and not Presbyterian, in the common sense of that word. I mention this as an

evidence of his candor and impartiality even in those things, on which, as a true son of the Church, he might have been expected to have been either silent, or more flattering in his remarks. It is a fact well known in Scotland, and in some regions in America, that his books contributed no little to making many independents and baptists.

The first quotation that I shall make from him, is from his Notes, critical and explanatory, on the most difficult and doubtful phrases in the New Testament, particularly the 4 Gospels. What I quote from him here, is intended as an answer to Mr. W's criticism upon Greek prepositions; and also bearing upon the word, *baptizo*. His words are the following, Boston Edition, pages 23 and 24 —“In water—in the Holy Ghost, *en udati en agio pneumatici*.” English Testament, *with water—with the holy ghost*—Vulgate—in *aqua, in Spiritu Sancto*. Thus, also, the Syriac and other ancient versions. All the modern translations from the Greek, which I have seen, render the words as our common version does, except Le Clerk, who says, *dans l'eau, dans le Saint Esprit*. I am sorry to say that the Popish translators from the vulgate, have shewn greater veneration for the style of that version, than the generality of protestant translators have shewn from that of the original. For in this the Latin is not more explicit than the Greek. Yet so inconsistent are the interpreters last mentioned, that none of them have scrupled to render “*en to Jordane*,” in the sixth verse, *in the Jordan*, though nothing can be plainer, that if there be any incongruity in the expression *in water*, this *in Jordan* must be equally incongruous. But they have seen that the preposition *en* could not be avoided there, without adopting a circumlocution, and saying, *with the water of Jordan*, which would have made their deviation from the text too glaring.

The word baptizein, both in sacred authors and in classical, signifies, to dip, to plunge, to immerse, and was rendered by Tertullian, the oldest of the Latin Fathers, *tingere*, the term used for dying cloth, which was by immersion. It is always construed suitably to this meaning—thus it is, *en udati, en to Jordano*. But I would not lay much stress on the preposition *en*, which answering to the Hebrew *beth*, may denote *with* as well as *in*,

did not the whole phraseology, in regard to this ceremony, concur in evincing the same thing. Accordingly the baptized are said *anabainein*, to arise, emerge or ascend, verse 16, *apo tou udatos*—and Acts 8, 39, *ex tou udatos*, from, or out of the water. Let it be observed farther, that the verbs *raino* and *rantizo* used in scripture for sprinkling, are never construed in this manner. I will sprinkle you with clean water, saith God, Ezek. 36 & 25, or as it runs in the English Bible literally from the Hebrew, I will sprinkle clean water upon you, in the Septuagint—*Raino eph'umas katharon udon*, and not as *baptizo* is always construed *Rano umas en katharo udati*. See, also, Exodus 29, 21: Lev. 6, 27—16, 14. Had *baptizo* been here employed in the sense of *raino*, I sprinkle, (which, as far as I know, it never is, in any use, sacred or classical,) the expression would, doubtless, have been, *Ego men baptizo eph umas udon*, or *apo tou udatos*, agreeably to the examples referred to. When, therefore, the Greek word *baptizo*, is adopted, I may say, rather than translated into modern languages, the mode of construction ought to be preserved, so far as may conduce to suggest its original import. It is to be regretted, that we have so much evidence that even good and learned men allow their judgment to be warped by the sentiments and customs of the sect which they prefer. *The true partizan, of whatever denomination, always inclines to correct the diction of the spirit by that of the party.* Thus far Mr. G. Campbell. I have thus brought a pedo-baptist to confront a pedo-baptist, a pedo-baptist to condemn a pedo-baptist; and it is done rationally, candidly and effectually, by a critic that has no superior in the sphere of his criticism. I could adduce many critical remarks, corroborative of Mr. C.'s criticism, but I deem it as unnecessary as to paint the diamond or perfume the rose. I would much rather silence Mr. W.'s critical remarks by learned men from his own ranks, than by my own observations or those of the baptists. With regard to the English of the word *bapto*, and *baptizo*, we shall further hear my namesake, Campbell's Critical Notes on Math. 20, 22, page 128, vol. 4—“*Undergo an immersion like that which I must undergo—To baptisma o ego baptizomai baptisthenai.*” Eng. Testament, “*To be baptized with the baptism which I must be baptized with.*” The primitive signification of *baptisma* is immersion, of bapti-

zein is, to immerse, plunge, or overwhelm. The noun ought never to be rendered *baptism*, nor the verb to baptize, but when employed to a religious ceremony. The verb *baptizein* sometimes, and *baptein*, which is synonymous, often occur in the Septuagint and Apocryphal writings, and is always rendered by one or other of these words, to dip, to wash, or to plunge. When the original expression, therefore, is rendered in familiar language, there appears nothing harsh or extraordinary in the metaphor; phrases like these—to be overwhelmed with grief, to be immersed in affliction, will be found common in most languages." This testimony is still more explicitly given in his "Dissertations," page 23, vol. 2d. He censures translators for translating certain names of rites and festivals, and for merely adopting the original names of others: his words are—Thus the word *peritome* they have translated *circumcisio*, (*circumcision*); but the word *baptisma* they have retained, changing only the letters from Greek to Roman. Yet the latter was just as susceptible of a literal version into Latin, as the former. *Immersio, tinctio*, (*immersion* or *dipping*) answers as exactly in the one case as *circumcisio* in the other. And if it be said of these words, that they do not rest on classical authority, the same is true also of this. Etymology, and the usage of ecclesiastical authors, are all that can be pleaded.

Now the use with respect to the names adopted in the Vulgate, has commonly been imitated, or rather implicitly followed, through the western parts of Europe. We have deserted the Greek names where the Latins have deserted them, and have adopted them where the Latins have adopted them. Hence we say *circumcision*, and not *peritomy*; and we do not say *immersion* but *baptism*. Yet when the language furnishes us with materials for a version, so exact and analogical, such a version conveys the sense more perspicuously than a foreign name. For this reason, I should think the word *immersion* (which, though of Latin origin, is an English noun regularly formed from the verb to immerse) a better English name than *baptism*, were we now at liberty to make a choice."

Mr. W. then, is sufficiently refuted by one of the ablest critics of the Presbyterian church, and therefore I am exempted from the trouble of doing it. That the whole task may not devolve on the labors of Mr. G. Campbell to

refute the Paidobaptists, I choose rather to state some facts, and to adduce some other evidences, that may confirm what I have already quoted, from the learned "Dissertations" and "Critical Notes."

It is a fact well known in some parts of Europe, and also to some persons in the United States, that king James, by whose authority the present common version of the scriptures was made, prohibited the translators from translating into English *baptisma* and *baptizo* where these words respected the rite; but ordered them to adopt these words, as they were adopted in the vulgate.* These were not the only words concerning which the king gave instructions. His object was to prevent any of the contending parties in the church, from having any superior advantage from the new version, choosing rather to adopt than translate such words as were a subject of dispute amongst controversialists, leaving each party to affix what meanings it chose to these words.—Had the translators been at liberty to have rendered these terms by appropriate words, the controversy would have been at an end long ere now. Instead of the command, "Be baptised every one of you," it would have read, be dipped every one of you, or be immersed every one of you. Instead of "baptise all nations," it would have read, *immerse* all nations. Instead of "he baptised him," it would have read, he immersed him—and instead of "he baptised at Enon because there was much water there," it would have been, he immersed at Enon because there was much water there. No controversy concerning the "*mode*" of baptism would have now existed. Every person would have read in plain English, that *immersion* was performed by *immersing*.

Another fact worthy to be remarked in this place is, that the Westminster Divines were much perplexed and divided on the "*action*" of baptism. Although they were convoked and authorised by the parliament, and their moderator appointed by the parliament, when forming the creed of millions of protestants, yet they retained so much regard for the meaning of the terms *baptisma* and *baptizo*, that they could not at once consent to establishing sprinkling as baptism. After long debating, the question was

* See Lewis's copy of the instructions given by king James, to the translators of the authorised translation of the Bible.

put to vote. There was an equal number on both sides. The moderator, yes, the parliamentary moderator, had the casting vote. I need scarcely tell you that, as he was the creature* of the parliament, he would and did vote for the easiest and "most polite" mode, in the cold climate of England. There were but 51 members present, besides the Lords that were appointed to watch them, that they might not transgress their commission. These 51 stood when the votes were taken thus, 26 for sprinkling, and 25 for immersion—the practice of all Episcopalians, Independants, and Presbyterians, rests upon the casting vote of this august moderator. As the poor Baptists neither had the disposition nor the privilege to be present, they were allowed to continue their practice upon the unanimous vote of all the Apostles who acted not under the commission of the parliament of England, but under the commission of the King of Kings and Lord of Lords.

Never was there an assembly of Divines so completely trammelled, as the Westminster Assembly. They were the humble servants of the parliament. "They were confined in their debates to such things as the parliament proposed. Many Lords and Commons were joined with them, to see that they did not go beyond their commission." They met in Henry the 7th's Chapel, and when they had served the purposes of the parliament they dismissed them. Such was the assembly that framed the Confession of Faith, so popular and so canonical amongst so many devout people of the United States and North Britain. The same parliament were of so devout a cast that they attempted to have a parliamentary Bible, and actually summoned a number of the same Divines, with some others, to write a commentary on the whole Bible, such as they would approve. They succeeded in this also, and when the work was finished they entitled it, emphatically, "*The Annotations on the Bible.*"

* The reader will pardon me for calling the moderator of the Westminster assembly the creature of the parliament, when he considers that he was created moderator by the parliament, and that, when the first moderator died, the parliament would not allow them to elect one from among themselves, but appointed a successor according to their own will. See the minutes of the assembly, met at Westminster, A. D. 1643. See also the life of Dr. Lightfoot, in his folio works.

A third fact that I shall mention, on this part of the subject, is, that the Greek Church, which must be supposed to understand their own language best; always immerse all subjects of the ordinance of Baptism—cold as their climate is, and numerous as their defects may be, they never, as the Roman Church, departed from the true action of baptism, but at all times practised immersion.

A fourth fact, corroborative of the above, is, that the ancient Latin fathers considered sprinkling, even when applied to those whose debility and impending dissolution prohibited immersion, not worthy to be called baptism.—Eusebius has these words recorded, page 113, spoken in the reign of Decius, against a certain person aspiring to the office of a bishop, viz. “He fell into a grievous distemper, and it being supposed that he would die immediately, he received baptism (being besprinkled with water) on the bed whereon we lay; (*if that can be called baptism.*)” Valesius hath the following note on this occurrence. “People that were sick could not be dipped in water by the priest, but *were sprinkled* with water by him. This baptism was thought imperfect, and not solemn (lawful) for several reasons. Also they who were thus baptised, were called ever afterwards *Clinici*, and by the 12th canon of the council of Neocæsarea, these Clinici were prohibited priesthood.”

I come now to add, to the authority of Campbell's Notes and Dissertations, the testimony of eminent lexicographers. I begin first with the renowned Scapula, the father of modern lexicons: *Bapto*, he defines *mergo*, *immergo*, item *lingo*, (*quod sit immer gendo*)—in English, to *plunge*, *immerse* or *dye*, *because coloring is done by immersing*. He quotes Luke 16, 24, in a “bapse to akron tou daktulou autau tou udatos”—“that he may dip the tip of his finger in water.” *Baptizo*, which, some pedit-baptists say, differs in signification, he defines, *mergo*, seu *immergo*, vel *submergo*, to *plunge*, *immerse*, *overwhelm*, or *plunge under*; also, *abluo*, to *wash*, as *tingo*, to *color*, being both the effects of dipping—he quotes Mark 7th as an instance of its being rendered to wash. How this washing was performed we shall shortly see.

We shall next cite the venerable Stockius: “*Baptizo* generatim ad vi vocis intinctionis ac immersionis notionem oblinct—Speciatim proprie est *immergere* ac *intingere in aquam*. Tropice, per metalepsin est lavare ablu-

ere, quia aliquid intingi ac immergi solet in aquam ut lavatur vel abluatur"—The English of which is; "Generally, it obtains by the natural import of the word, the idea of *dipping in*, or *immersing*. Specially, and properly, it signifies to *immerse* or to *dip*—figuratively, it signifies to wash, because any thing that is washed is usually dipped or immersed in water." Such is the meaning given by Stockius—he says, moreover, with a view to the pedo-baptist system, on Mark 7th, that washing may be performed by sprinkling water on the thing to be washed—but this is not given as a meaning of the word, but as an accommodation of the term washing, to the views of his practice as a pedo-baptist. Under the term *baptisma*, which he explains immersion, or dipping in water, he observes, "this word is used to designate the first sacrament, which they call the sacrament of initiation, namely baptism, in which the baptised were, in former times, immersed in water."—"Even as now they are sprinkled with water." Under the word *baptismos*, he uses these words: "Hinc transfertur ad *baptismum sacramentalem* ubi baptizandus olim in aqua immergebatur, ut a peccati sordibus ablueretur, ac in fœdus gratiæ reciperetur."—Hence this word is applied to the sacrament of baptism, because, in ancient times, the baptised was immersed in water, that the filth of sin might be washed away, and that he might be received into the Covenant of Grace.

After these authorities, it will be of no great consequence to cite Parkhurst, who is but a follower of them and G. Campbell. Under the word *baptizo*, from *bapto*, to dip, he, however, accords with them in the six meanings he gives to it—1. To dip, immerse, or plunge in water—2. "Mid and pass, to *wash oneself, be washed, wash*, i. e. the hands, by immersion or dipping in water—3. "To baptise, to immerse in, or wash with, water, in token of purification from sin." Under the first meaning he adds, that the meaning there placed under it, does not strictly occur in the New Testament, but only so far as it is included in the second and third meanings above quoted. His 4th, 5th and 6th meanings are the figurative uses of the term in scripture, and are analogical to what he says is the 6th acceptation of it, in the New Testament—"To be immersed or plunged in a flood or sea, as it were of grievous afflictions and sufferings." *Baptisma*, he explains "an immersion or washing with water," im-

mersing in grievous and overwhelming afflictions. He manifests a degree of reluctance in thus explaining it, knowing it to be condemnatory of his system; but he is constrained, with those authorities I have before quoted full in his view, to admit the meanings given by Scapula, Stockius and Campbell. From all these authorities we cannot acquire one idea favorable to sprinkling. Dipping or immersion is the uniform meaning of the term.—Nor can there be one solitary instance found in all the Dictionaries of the Greek language, nor in classical use, that *bapto* or *baptizo* signifies to sprinkle or pour. The Greek language, the most philosophic in its construction of all languages, does not use words in a manner so lax and incongruous. *Raino* signifies to sprinkle, and *bapto* to dip. *Rantizo* signifies to besprinkle or scatter all over, and *baptizo* to plunge or immerse all over. With as much propriety we might say, that to sprinkle and to immerse are one and the same thing, as that *baptizo* and *rantizo* were of one and the same import. The ideas attached to each term are as distinct as the words themselves.

That Mr. W. may rebut the Paido-baptist authorities which I have empanneled against him, I give place to him.

Mr. W. then proceeded:

I was telling you, my friends, that Mr. C. was going to give you "a bundle" of Greek, and you see I was not mistaken. He has read you a "bundle" of Campbell, but this Campbell did not care much how baptism was administered, he is so much the more suitable to be quoted by my opponent. With regard to all these dictionary authorities I only observe, that it may be so and so, and yet so long as they admit that "*to wash*" is one meaning of the term, it is easy for us to shew that washing may be performed by sprinkling. I shall read you a passage from Mark 7th, and make some observations on it, which will serve to shew that the term was used to denote *sprinkling*: Mark 7th, 2, 4, "And when they saw some of his disciples eat bread with defiled (that is to say with unwashen) hands, they found fault; for the Pharisees, and all the Jews, except they wash their hands oft, eat not, holding the tradition of the elders. And when they come from the market, except they wash, they eat not. And

many other things there be, which they have received to hold, as the washing of cups and pots, and of brazen vessels and tables." In the fourth verse we have parts of the verb *baptizo*—it would read, according to Campbell, "And when they come from the market, except they are immersed, they eat not." Again, in the last clause of the verse the same word occurs, "*baptismous*," the baptisms or immersions of cups, pots and tables. Are we then to suppose that the Jews, every time they came home from market, dipped themselves in water, or that they dipped their cups and tables in water every time they washed them? Now we must either admit that the Jews washed by sprinkling or pouring, or baptised by sprinkling, or that they dipped themselves all over in water every time they came from market. I insist, then, that the term *baptizo* signifies to wash, and that this washing must have been done by sprinkling, and not by dipping; and if, in one place, or in some places, it signifies to wash by sprinkling, it may do so in many others. I then continue to hold fast my integrity, and to maintain that baptism may be administered by sprinkling.

Mr. C. has been so much engaged in reading Greek, that he forgot to reply to what I advanced concerning the analogy, that sprinkling bears to the application of the blood of Christ, as represented in this ordinance. Perhaps he wishes to wave the discussion of that part of the subject—he was also entertaining us with the Westminster Divines, and the parliamentary moderator, the creature of the court of parliament. I consider it no disparagement to a good man to be appointed by the parliament, nor does it, in my opinion, weaken the influence of his decision, on the various subjects discussed in that assembly. I would wish to know how my opponent views the word *embapto*, it occupies no distinct place in the Greek language, if *bapto* is to be translated *dip*. The truth is, that *embapto* is the only word translated *dip* in the New Testament, and must be somewhat different from *bapto*, else there is a prefixed syllable, which has no meaning.

My friends—this is the last time that I am to address you on this occasion. According to the arrangement made, my opponent will finish the debate. It is my place, then, to draw my remarks to a close; and I would briefly observe, that I never argued with any person, that appea-

red more to feel the force of my arguments, than my present opponent. You will, no doubt, many of you at least, have observed, with what difficulty he replied to many things I advanced. I have no doubt, he will strive to persuade you, that he has had the best of the argument; but I have no doubt, that many of you are so well informed, that you will not be led by him. It is not the man who has the most to say, that is always right. Nay, the truth is plain, and does not require so much to defend it, as error requires to maintain its precarious ground. I hope you, who have been baptised in your infancy, will realize the obligations you are under; and you, who have dedicated your children to the Lord in baptism, will see that you bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, and make them acquainted with the vows which you have vowed for them; and thus both you and they will receive the benefits arising from the ordinance of infant baptism; and the difference betwixt your children, and those of others, who deny them the seal of the covenant, will be the more conspicuous. I must, then, entreat you to judge impartially for yourselves, on the merits of all that has been said, on both sides, and ever follow that which is good.

My last reply was to the following effect—

I shall now bring forward another extract from Mr. Campbell, which will place, in true light, those verses quoted by Mr. Walker, from Mark 7, 2—4. I expected Mr. W. would bring forth this passage, so much hackneyed by the paidobaptists—I presume it was with a view to correct the false glosses of his brethren that Mr. G. Campbell wrote the following article. If he stood in my place this day, he could not use words better calculated to silence my opponent and to expose the fallacy and insignificance of his remarks. I shall, therefore, satisfy myself with merely transcribing them—I shall first transcribe his translation of the passage, and then his critical notes upon it.

Campbell's Gospels, Sect. 4, page 71—Mark 7, 2—
 “When these observed some of his disciples eat, with impure (that is unwashen) hands, they found fault. For the Pharisees, and all the Jews, who observe the traditions of the Elders, eat not until they have washed their hands, by pouring a little water upon them, and if

be come from the market, *by dipping them*; and "many other usages there are which they have adopted, as baptisms of cups and pots, and brazen vessels, and *beds*."—His critical notes on this passage, are, page 205, vol. 4: "A small degree of attention will suffice to convince a judicious reader, that there must be a mistake in the common version of this passage. For if, by what we are told, v. 3d, we are to understand, as it is allowed by every body, that they did not eat on any occasion, till they had washed their hands; to what purpose was this added, v. 4: "And when they come from the market, except they wash, they eat not? Could any person suppose that, if washing before meals was a duty, their having been at market, where they were more exposed to defilement, would release them from the obligation? Besides, there is, in the first clause, an indistinctness and obscurity which leaves the reader much at a loss for the meaning. "Except they wash oft, they eat not." Does this imply that they must wash often before every meal? Or that their washing frequently before one meal, will compensate for their not washing at all before another? It is well known, and indeed the circumstances of the story, as related here, and in Math. may satisfy us, that neither of these was the case. For illustrating this passage, let it be observed, 1st—That the two verbs rendered *wash* in the common Testament are different in the original. The first is, *nipson-tai*, properly translated *wash*; the second is "*baptisontai*" which limits us to a particular mode of washing, for *baptizo* denotes *to plunge, to dip*." (Here follows a criticism on *pugme* which is foreign to our purpose—he resumes the subject, p. 206:.) "*Baptisesthai*, says the excellent critic Wetstein, with which I concur (as also Bishop Pearce) "*est manus aquæ immergere, niptesthai manibus affundere*." The former signifies *to dip* the hands in water, the latter to sprinkle them with water. This is more especially the import when the words are, as here, opposed to each other, otherwise *neptein*, like the general word *to wash* in English, may be used for *baptizein* *to dip*, because the genus comprehends the species; but not conversely *baptizein* for *niptein* the species for the genus.—By this interpretation, the words, which, as rendered in the common version, are unmeaning, appear both significant and emphatical; and the contrast in the Greek is preserved in the translation. The Vulgate does not confound,

the two verbs as the English Testament does : at the same time it fails in marking the precise meaning of each.—Pharisæi enim—nisi crebo laverint manus, non manducant: et a foro, nisi baptizentur, non comedunt. For the Pharisees unless they frequently wash, do not eat: and when they come from the market unless they are dipped, or (dip themselves) they eat not.”

Maimonides says of this custom amongst the Jews, and who could know better than a Jewish Rabbín of those times? “they washed in a laver which holds 40 seahs of water, which are not drawn; every defiled man *dips* himself, except a profluous man, and in it they dip all unclean vessels, as cups, pots, and brazen vessels.”

A paido-baptist, then, refutes Mr. W’s view of Mark 7 so completely as not to require a word from a baptist on the subject.

His remark on “*embapto*” is in no wise better than his comment on Mark 7—4. It is not a fact, that *embapto* is the only word rendered *dip*, in the common version. See Luke 16-24, “*ina bapse to akron*”—That he may dip the tip of his finger in water, here it is *bapto*, and not *embapto*. that is used. Again John 13-26 “*bapsas*” a part of *bapto* is rendered dipped—“when I have dipped it.” Again, in Revel. 19-13, *bebamenor*, the participle of *bapto*, is translated *dip*—“his garment *dipped* in blood.” On these three phrases Parkhurst observes, that *bapteinudatos* is a good Greek phrase for *dipping* in water.—Where now is Mr. W’s criticism and his fact concerning *embapto*. *Embapto* occurs in John 13 and 26 and is there translated as *bapsas*, “and when he had dipped the sop,” so that it is synonymous with *bapto*, only expressive of the same idea with a greater emphasis—Stokius and Scapula explain it by *mergo*, *immergo*, just as they do *bapto*, and Parkhurst renders it in English to dip in—*bapto* and *embapto*, occur, each, three times in the New Testament, and are alike translated *to dip* or *to dip in*, in every place they occur. Mr. W’s criticisms in this, as in all former instances, will not bear the test. When weighed in the balance they are found wanting.

I come now to the last branch of the argument to be submitted at this time. My opponent has told you of my neglect in not replying to his remarks on the “blood of sprinkling,” and the analogy of sprinkling water to the sprinkling of blood. My reason for so doing was, that

I might, when illustrating the meaning of baptism, review them to more advantage.

I deny that baptism has a respect to the blood of sprinkling, but that it denotes "the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the holy ghost, and is emblematical of the burial and resurrection of Christ, and of our death and burial with him unto sin, and of our resurrection with him to a new life. Thus saith the Apostle, Rom. 6, 4—6, "*Buried with him by baptism into death, that like as Christ was raised from the dead, by the glory of the father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together, in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection.*" To the same effect, speaks the Apostle in his Epistle to the Colossians, 2, 12, and Peter in his 1st Epistle 3, 21. The like figure whereunto (viz. Noah's being saved in the Ark) even baptism doth also now save us (not the putting off of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ. In all the Apostolic expositions we have of the doctrinal import of baptism, there is not one, that in the least favors Mr. W's. representation of it. But on the contrary its meaning is, that we are dead and buried with Christ, and must rise with him, which is figuratively called "the renewing of the Holy Ghost." Not one reference to the blood of sprinkling—that is another subject, and had and still has, a memorial and representation of it, namely, in the Lord's supper. I am again confirmed in the belief that one error always leads to another, and Mr. W. in maintaining his human tradition, is compelled to abandon the scripture import of baptism, and to substitute a conjecture of his own, to make his system hang together—this is what I most of all deplore in the error of infant sprinkling; that it misleads and bewilders those who receive it, in respect of the true meaning of the sacred institutions. Each of the Christian positive institutes, has a primary respect to some leading part of the Christian faith. Thus, the Lord's Day is commemorative of the day of Christ's resurrection—the Lord's Supper, of the breaking of his body, and the pouring out of his blood, to make atonement for the sins of many, and to bring in a justifying righteousness, in behalf of the guilty. The ordinance of baptism, has respect to events subsequent to his death, namely, his burial and resurrection. So that the whole outlines of the

Christian faith, are exhibited, illustrated, and enforced, in the positive institutes of Christianity. But take Mr. W's view of it and what does it represent? That which other positive rites inculcate;—It is a repetition without a meaning of that already exhibited in the Lord's supper.

I do not mean to say that the Lord's supper, in due form, exhibits the sprinkling of blood, but it exhibits *that* more fully, which the sprinkling of blood denoted, viz. the pardon of our sins, and the acceptance of our persons through the righteousness of Christ, "brought in" by the shedding of his blood—and our joint participation of it denotes our joint interest in that blood, as much, yea, and more fully, than the sprinkling of the blood of animals on the congregation of Israel denoted their joint interest in that typical blood.

When baptism is spoken of, in relation to the influence of the Holy Spirit, it denotes the overwhelming influence of that Almighty agent, in consequence of which, all the faculties of the human mind are imbued with it. Such always was the effect produced on the minds of those who had, in the primitive age of Christianity, received the baptism of the Holy Ghost. Hence "*the renewing of the Holy Spirit,*" is a phrase that denotes the influence of the Holy Spirit, exerted on the whole soul of man; and implied a death unto sin, and a new life unto righteousness. But the Apostle illustrates this subject in the most clear and convincing manner, in those passages I have read from him. He shews it to be a spiritual discovery of the import of the death and resurrection of Christ, that produces this change upon the mind; and which leads the subject of this gracious work to submit to "be buried with Christ in baptism," "to be planted in the likeness of his death, that he may be in the likeness of his resurrection." The outward rite, then, must bear an analogy to the doctrine exhibited in and by it. Hence immersion in water, is a beautiful and striking representation of our faith in the death and burial of Christ; and our emerging out of it, a suitable emblem of his resurrection from the grave, and of our obligations to a new life: so that the sprinkling of a few drops of water has no analogy to the thing signified in baptism.

The meaning of the word *baptism*, as fully ascertained in the preceding disquisition—the places where this rite was administered—in rivers, and where there was much

water—the circumstances connected with the administering & receiving of it, such as *their going down into*, and *their coming up out of*, the water; together with the doctrinal import of it, as respecting the burial and resurrection of Christ, all concur in demonstrating that immersion, and immersion only, is the baptism taught in the scriptures. So that the result of our whole investigation issues in this, that the immersion of believers, or of professed disciples, is the only baptism of divine appointment.

Thus, my friends, I have followed Mr. W. through all his meanderings, and at last I am safely moored in a secure haven. It would be culpable in me, if, from a false modesty, I should hesitate to avow my feelings on the close of this debate. The triumph of truth and argument over error and sophistry, is, to every upright mind, a source of present joy, and a pleasing prelude of that complete and universal victory, which truth shall ultimately achieve over all error and deceit: I have very little to ascribe to myself on this occasion. I ascribe the victory, this day obtained, to the goodness of my cause, and neither to my ingenuity nor dexterity. My opponent manifested considerable ingenuity on certain occasions, and his complete failure is to be ascribed to the badness of his cause, not to his want of genius or expression.

I am sorry that I cannot compliment Mr. Findley, Mr. Walker's moderator, for his impartiality on this occasion. His partiality has been so manifest to you all, as to require no comment from me; I merely wish to let you know that I am conscious of it, and that my not speaking of it sooner, was not from the want of perception, but to preserve that decorum in the course of the debate, which I considered comely, and from which I was determined not to be forced, even by treatment still more flagrant. I would rather have suffered still more unbecoming treatment, than to have transgressed the bounds of propriety, which I hope ever to prescribe to myself. I freely forgive him; attributing it to a misguided zeal, and hope you will also forgive him.

Mr. W. in his concluding remarks observed, that he never argued with any person, who seemed more to feel the force of his remarks, than I did. What success he may have had heretofore, I know not, but I must confess the "force" of his remarks at this time was easily felt;

and as easily repelled. The force which they may have in his own mind, I conceive is altogether *factitious*, and therefore it is confined to the regions of fancy, and cannot surmount the *real* obstacles, which reason must present to its progress. I came here under high assurances of the *force* that was to be exerted to convince and silence me; and if I had been very credulous, I might have hoped to be convinced of my errors, which are so unprofitable to me, in a pecuniary point of view; and to be so far converted from them, as to open the way to my union with the *respectable paido-baptists*; but alas! I must return to the "*poor baptists*," and take up my abode with them a while longer—and this too, not for the want of a desire to be convinced of my errors, but for the want of the *force* of evidence, to even produce a suspicion that I was wrong; nay, verily, such has been the force of my opponent's reasoning, that I am more confirmed in the correctness of my views on this subject, and of the fallacy and deceptious tendency of all reasoning in support of the cause my opponent endeavors to maintain.

But, my friends, let me address a few remarks to you on the whole matter. You have heard, and patiently attended to this tedious debate. What are you now to do?—I will answer this question for you—go home and read your Bibles—examine the testimonies of these holy oracles—judge for yourselves, and be not implicit followers of the clergy—amongst the clergy of different denominations I charitably think there are a few good men: but as a body of men—"they have taken away the key of knowledge from the people." And *how*, do you say? By teaching you to look up to them for instruction, as children to a father—by preventing you from judging for yourselves; through an impression that you are not competent to judge for yourselves.—This is a prevailing opinion with many. Of what use, then, is the Bible to the bulk of mankind, if you are not to presume, & examine it for yourselves or to think yourselves capable of judging of it? This is to make you the dupes of haughty leaders who will cause you to err. To attempt directly or indirectly to dissuade you from thinking and examining for yourselves, by putting creeds already framed into your hands, or the works of men instead of the pure word, is, in my opinion, so far depriving you of the key of knowledge. I do not say that all the clergy are doing so, but I am aware that a vast majority of them are doing so.

Because I have taken this course which I recommend to you, I have been stigmatized with many opprobrious epithets. Sometimes, as being very changeable. Although, I have to this day undeviatingly pursued the same course, which I commenced nearly as soon as I was of age, and have now prosecuted it for almost ten years, viz. to teach, to believe, to practice nothing in religion, for which I cannot produce positive precept, or approved precedent, from the word of God. Assuming this principle, and pursuing it, made me a baptist, and I continue to practice it unto this day. Because I say that all christianity is contained in the New Testament, as the Patriarchal and Jewish religion is contained in the Old, with many predictions of New Testament times; I say, because I maintain that the New Testament scriptures are a perfect, complete and perspicuous rule of faith and practice, as far as respects christianity: I am called an Antinomian, and am impeached with utterly throwing away the Old Testament scriptures. These, and many other insinuations as malicious and unfounded as these, have been suggested against me, which are as far from my sentiments and practice, as the east is distant from the west. These vile slanders may serve the cause of a party for a little while, but will ultimately fall upon the heads of the fabricators of them. If you then should think of judging for yourselves, and of following the dictates of the Divine word and your own consciences, enlightened by it, you must not think that any strange thing has happened unto you, if you should become the objects of reproach. But remember "the triumph of the wicked is short."—"And if ye be reproached for the name of Christ, happy are ye."

I have now accepted the invitation or challenge of the Seceders, and having now fully satisfied their most eager desires for an interview of this kind, I conceive it is my time to give an invitation or challenge to *any pedo-baptist minister*; and to return the compliment with the utmost ceremoniousness, I this day publish to all present, that I feel disposed to meet *any pedo-baptist minister of any denomination, of good standing in his party, and I engage to prove in a debate with him, either viva voce, or with the pen, that Infant Sprinkling is a human tradition and injurious to the well being of society, religious and political.* I have to add, that I must have an equal vote in

determining the time and place. This is the only restriction I attach to the challenge I now publish.*

To conclude—I presume, my friends, you have evidence sufficient before your minds to enable you to decide on which side of this argument truth lies. You have seen that Mr. W. has not been able to maintain any one position that he assumed in this debate. If what you have already heard, does not open your eyes, and convince your judgment, you are under the tyrannical dominion of prejudices, the most obstinate and irrational.—Human power is too weak, with all its persuasive energies, to subdue the prejudiced mind, that is obstinately bent on maintaining its present views. But will you ask yourselves what is the gain you acquire by a bigotted attachment to principles and practices which depend upon the will of man, and not upon any revelation of the will of Heaven. Will you ask yourselves in relation to your practices, this question, which was once proposed from Heaven, to a rebellious and stiff-necked people—“Who hath required this at your hands?”—“*Will worship*” has ever been obnoxious to the wrath of Heaven. And what is will worship? Harken to the voice of him who speaketh from Heaven—“In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.” And every thing is a commandment of men, which is not commanded in the Bible.

You, who are convinced that the practice of infant sprinkling is unfounded in scripture, and have never obeyed the Divine commandment, and yet profess to be christians; let me ask you for a reason of your conduct. Does the fear of man, or the shame of being pointed at, prevent you from obedience to the Divine will? If so; I have only to remind you of the words of him who will soon judge you. “If any man be ashamed of me, or of my words, in the midst of a perverse generation, of him shall

* Since the debate at Mt. Pleasant, I was invited to attend to a debate at Mount Vernon, state of Ohio. The invitation came to me two days before the day appointed for the debate, with the space of 160 miles between.—Messrs. Scott and Cunningham, Presbyterian Ministers, gave the challenge to a Mr. Rigden of those parts. I have never heard the result of their debate, but would humbly inform Messrs. Scott and Cunningham, that if they think they have done any thing clever, they may have an opportunity of doing it again with their humble servant, at a proper time and place.

the son of man be ashamed, when he shall come in the glory of his father, with all the holy angels."

You who have believed and have been baptized, see that you walk worthy of your profession, and that the good cause be not dishonored by your impropriety of deportment—"Be zealous to maintain good works—do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly—live soberly, righteously, and godly—and add to your faith, virtue; and to virtue, knowledge; and to knowledge, temperance; and to temperance, patience; and to patience godliness; and to godliness, brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness, charity. For if these things be in you and abound, they make you that you shall neither be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ—but he that lacketh these things is blind, and cannot see afar off, and hath forgotten that he was purged from his old sins."

END OF THE DEBATE.

APPENDIX.

PREFACE.

AS the intention of this publication is to form a treatise on baptism, I consider it necessary to add some things, further illustrative of this much disputed subject, which did not obviously present themselves in the course of the preceding debate. Being obliged to follow the course which Mr. Walker prescribed, I could not deviate so far as to introduce new topics of illustration, nor even to prosecute some things introduced, to such a length as I deemed expedient, to place them in the most advantageous light; I therefore design this Appendix to do something to supply those deficiencies. Being now disentangled from those trammels in which I have been so long fettered, I hope to enjoy the liberty of choosing my own course, and of pursuing it so far as may appear agreeable and entertaining. I shall, however, endeavor not to abuse this liberty, but to use it in subordination to the edification and satisfaction of my readers. I was desirous that Mr. Walker should occupy a part of this Appendix, to atone for some deficiencies in his part of the debate, and therefore, I posted to him the following epistle, to which I obtained no reply.

Mr. WALKER:

SIR—I desire to acquaint you with my plan and progress in publishing our debate. I have just got it in the press—24 pages of it are printed this week. I expect to be able to have 24 pages per week printed until finished. I give the arguments on both sides with all the fairness and impartiality possible. I design publishing a second Appendix on such topics as were not fully discussed. I conceive it to be necessary, on the footing of common justice, that you should have the liberty of publishing in the Appendix, any additional light you may

be able to throw on the subject. If you will, then, send on any article, not exceeding 24 pages in print, duodecimo size, it shall be published, *literatim et punctuatim*, as you forward it to me. I think this will be necessary on your part; for in transcribing the debate from all the notes I have, I discover that there is much repetition, and a considerable scarcity of matter and of argument, on some topics which you advanced. This, I presume, you may remedy by the article I have mentioned; and as it is my design, Sir, to do you and the subject all the justice in my power, I can assure you, I will with pleasure attend to any thing you may advance, if forwarded within three weeks. As it will require more paper than I have ordered, should you furnish the article requested, it will be necessary for me to know your intentions by return of mail, that I may make arrangements in that department for the admission of your article. You will please, then, write immediately, and inform me of your intentions.

I am,

Respectfully,

Yours,

July, 1820.

A. CAMPBELL.

It is now about eight weeks since the above letter was addressed to the care of Mr. Miller, teacher, Cadiz, for Mr. Walker, and yet no reply.

This Appendix shall contain a few separate articles in a detached form, yet all having an immediate bearing on the main subject of dispute.—From the small experience I have already had, I discover that it is not generally prudent to promise much in the preface; and as each article in the subsequent sheets shall speak for itself, the judicious reader, who patiently examines the work to the end, will be able to form a more correct idea of the whole, than I can now present to his mind. Besides, I have often considered it unfair in the author of any work, to attempt to prepossess the minds of his readers by prefatory remarks which may, in the least degree, prevent the reader from an impartial investigation of the subject. In hopes that the reader may exercise the utmost impartiality in perusing the following pages, I proceed, questioning him to consider that there is but one true standard, by which all religious tenets must be tried, to bring all things to that test, and to hold fast that which is good.

September 29th, 1820.

ARTICLE No. 1.

PEDO-BAPTIST TEXTS.

THERE is no religious sect in Christendom, that has not a few texts of scripture, that, apparently, and in the estimation of the party, really, support the distinguishing tenets of the sect. These, alas! too often, constitute the rigid sectary's Bible. These few texts circumscribe, in many instances, the whole of his biblical knowledge. If he can recite but one text of the Sacred Scriptures, that text is the hobby-horse of his party, and which, to him, is all in all. Perhaps there may be some, who consider this one of the advantages resulting from the existence of religious sects; because, that were it not necessary to have a few texts, at all times ready, to support the Shibboleth of the party, the rigid sectarian would not commit a verse of the Bible to memory. This, however, in my opinion, is meagre commendation; for if party zeal produces this particular acquaintance with certain texts, and no higher motive leads to the acquisition of them, they cannot be a gain to the possessor. There are some who may excuse themselves thus: "They never hear their preachers insist, with any energy, on any texts, but such as particularly express the peculiar sentiments of the sect." This extenuation of culpable ignorance, is a plain acknowledgement, that the Bible is not studied, farther than the preacher pleases to explain it; and that the hearers are determined that the priest's lips shall keep knowledge, and circumscribe that of the people.

The pedo-baptist texts which are usually resorted to, to support the practice implied in the word "*pedo-baptist*," are somewhat remarkable, and distinguished from that class of texts which is usually employed in supporting the discriminating lines and boundaries of the sects they are supposed to favor. For, generally, there is some mention made of the tenet, or some remote hint of the doctrine, or practice, to be supported, in the verses cited for that purpose. But in the texts cited, in support of infant sprinkling, there is not one, that mentions the thing, or makes the slightest allusion to the practice. Nor is there one word in the whole Bible, that explains the meaning or im-

port of such a rite. Hence it is, that the different sects that agree in the practice, have each their own views of the meaning of it—thus the Church of Rome places it the first of the seven Sacraments, and believes that it absolves all previous guilt, and leaves the infant innocent as Adam in paradise. The church of England says, that, “it makes the subject of it, a child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of Glory.” The Church of Scotland, or Presbyterian Church, says, “that it doth signify and seal our ingrafting into Christ, and partaking of the benefits of the Covenant of Grace, and our engagement to be the Lords.” Different sects of Dissenters have different views of it, and express them in their respective formulas, which, in part, correspond with the substance of the above. The Seceders say, that in baptism “we do (i. e. the infant) *swear*, to be *only* and *wholly* the Lords.” The baptists differ from them all, and think, with scripture and reason on their side, that it seals nothing to the infant, that it signifies or imports nothing to it, but that its father was a member of a pedo-baptist Church, and at the time of its baptism, under the influence of the doctrines and commandments of men; and that it secures nothing to the infant but the name its parents pleased to impose on it.

There is another peculiarity in those texts which are usually cited to prove infant sprinkling, that I do not recollect to have seen noticed, it is this, that there is not one text cited to prove the whole of the custom or rite. One class of texts is brought forward to prove one part of the practice; and another class, to prove another part of it. Just as if I should attempt to prove that the sprinkling of bells, was a divine appointment, as the Romanists believe; I should begin to prove that bells were once appointed to be used under the law, which I can soon do, and then proceed to shew, that sprinkling blood was the usual way of consecrating any thing not before dedicated to the Lord; and that water now was the antitype or emblem answering thereunto. The covenants being still the same, the holiness of times and things yet remaining as of old—I join together both ends of my argument, and thus usher in the baptism of bells, with as good a grace as infant baptism makes its appearance. My design under this article is to examine one or two texts, often quoted by the pedo-baptists; but which Mr. Walker either forgot, or was ashamed to bring forward in the preceding

debate. The first of these is Math. 28, 19—"Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," "teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." The argument raised on these words is, that as all nations are commanded to be baptized, and infants are a part of all nations; therefore infants are commanded to be baptized. This is the most plausible syllogism that a pedo-baptist can adduce; and yet when it is examined, it not only makes nothing *for*, but a strong argument *against*, the practice of infant sprinkling. The verse reads—"teach all nations, baptizing them." *Teaching* precedes *baptizing* in the order of this commission, and is, in the original, different from the word rendered teaching in the next verse—*Matheteusati* in the 19th verse, and *didaskontes* in the 20th. The first signifies *disciple*, or *make disciples* in all nations—the latter signifies instructing those when made disciples. The former denotes teaching the first principles, to make disciples; and the latter, teaching those disciples the sublimer doctrines, principles, and practices, of Christianity. But, that this criticism may not rest upon my authority, I will quote some pedo-baptist critics—Parkhurst and Wakefield render it "*make disciples*," Pyle and Campbell "*convert*." Guise and Scott "*disciple all nations*."—Wynne, "*make disciples in all nations*." That the latter meaning, which is the same in substance with the preceding, fully expresses the meaning intended to be conveyed in the words of the commission, is incontrovertibly evident from the following criticism. The object of "*discipling*" is expressed "*panta ta ethne*"—all nations; but the subject of baptizing is another gender than *ta ethne*; it is *autous*, *them*. The word "*autous*" *them*, in the original is masculine, and does not agree with "*panta ta ethne*," all nations, which is neuter; but refers to "*mathetas*" *disciples*, which is included in the verb *matheteusati* "*make disciples*"—the verse then reads—teach, or make disciples out of all nations, baptizing them that are taught, or made disciples; and this is clear from the parallel passage in Mark;—"Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature; *he that believeth and is baptised shall be saved*." None then are commanded to be baptized, but such as are first *taught*, or made disciples.—To accommodate this verse to the pedo-baptists, it should

read this—Go, baptize all nations, and then teach them—For this is their practice first to sprinkle, and then instruct—but the commission of Christ says, first teach, and then baptize—so that this passage authorises baptists in their practice, and condemns the practice of the pedo-baptists.

Certain writers on infant baptism have admitted the substance of the preceding criticism on Math. 28, 19, 20, and endeavor to come off in this way—"That infants are disciples, and consequently should be baptised." Yea, and they quote scripture to prove it too!—The following extract is from Dr. Lathrop, a very popular writer amongst Pedo-baptists—than whom, a greater sophist on this subject has not appeared, for the twenty-five years last past—"Now," says he, "if we can show that infants are ever considered as *disciples*, as belonging to Christ, then it will appear that they come within the commission, Disciple all nations. To prove this, he quotes Math. 18, 5, "Whosoever shall receive one such little child in my name, receiveth me." Then he attempts to prove, that receiving them in Christ's name, is to receive them *as his disciples*. To prove this, he quotes Mark 9, 41, and then Math. 10, 42—but unfortunately for the doctor, the little child with which he set out, Math. 18, 5, was not an infant in the modern sense, but an infant believer: see the following verse, "One of these little ones *that believe* in me." This, then, overthrows the fabric the Doctor was building; for in quoting the 6th verse of Math. 18, we pull the foundation from his superstructure, and down it comes. The Doctor next ingeniously attempts to prove that infants are called disciples, from Acts 15, 10, "Why tempt ye God to put a yoke on the neck of the disciples, which neither we nor our fathers were able to bear.—'*Infants*' were to be circumcised after the manner of Moses, and therefore are comprehended among the disciples, on whom the yoke would be laid." Now had not a Doctor said so, I would have considered it out of all character to reply to a figment so puerile, so diminutive—but as Doctors are great men, we must bear with them. Pray Doctor, did you read the first verse of this fifteenth chapter, before you quoted the tenth? I presume not—it reads thus: "And certain men which came down from Judea taught the brethren, and said, 'except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved.'" These were the Gentile brethren that had

believed the Gospel, whom those ancient Judaizers wished to have conformed to Judaism—yea, in the 5th verse, "Some of the Pharisees told them, that it was needful to circumcise (those of the Gentiles that had believed) and to command them to keep the law of Moses." These were Dr. Lathrop's infant disciples, on whom they were about to put the yoke of observing the whole law of Moses. Shall I further expose the Doctor? No: the verses need but to be read, and the Doctor's scheme is no where to be found.

To talk of an infant disciple, or to say that an infant of eight or ten days old can be a disciple or scholar of Christ, not only contradicts all scripture, but shocks all common sense. The Doctor's work on Christian baptism, exhibits many rare specimens of logic, of a piece with the above.

Mr. John P. Campbell, of Kentucky, who has gone to his long home, and who has passed the scrutiny of that judgment seat, from which there is no appeal, was a writer of much superior talent to the Doctor, though he was never dubbed Doctor: for there are great men that are not dubbed Doctors, and there are Doctors that are not great men. Mr. Campbell's work is still with us, and is the most dignified performance on the subject of infant sprinkling that I have seen. A considerable part of his book has been already reviewed, under the argument from ecclesiastical history, and while discussing the import of *bapto* and *baptizo*, with some prepositions. Whatever diversity of talents may distinguish pedo-baptist writers on this subject, there must always be so much similarity amongst them, that when one of them is refuted, they are all refuted. The arguments of Mr. Campbell of Kentucky, are just the same as those of Peter Edwards, or Dr. Lathrop, or even Mr. Walker, with an exception of some of the excentricities of the latter on the Covenants; only with this difference that they are exhibited in a better style—Farmer John is the same man, whether dressed in his plain homespun, or whether he has got on his Sunday broad cloth, that was ferried over the vast Atlantic.

I shall briefly exhibit a species of sophistry which runs through this work of Mr. Campbell's. It is very conspicuous in his disquisition on prepositions—it is called in the schools, "*A dicto secundum quid, ad dictum simpliciter*"

oiter." Or in English, when we argue from that which is true in particular circumstances, to prove the same thing true simply, abstract from all circumstances. Under this species of sophistry, and another which is called "*Fallacia accidentis*"—or when we say, a thing *must* be, because it *may* be, which together are the same with drawing a general conclusion from particular premises, are the greater part of all his arguments to be ranked in support of this tradition. To exemplify this, I will briefly notice his disquisition on the prepositions *eis en ex* and *apo*—pages 50–53—Mr. C. has found some passage where the preposition *eis* may be translated *at*, and therefore in all places where baptism is spoken of, it *must* be translated *at*—thus he translates Mark 1–9. "And was baptised of John *at* Jordan"—Now I affirm, without fear of refutation, that the preposition *eis* is, in all books where it occurs, translated, to say the least, one hundred times by *into*, for once it is translated *at*; and that *into* is acknowledged by all Lexicographers and Greek critics, yea, by Mr. C. himself, to be the common meaning of *eis*: yet, notwithstanding, when placed before a river, or any water used for baptism, there it *must never* signify *into* but always, *at*, or *towards*!!! Bring the subjects of baptism *towards*, *near to*, or even place them *at* the edge of the river, but never *into* it. Ah! that is the killing word. But these critics, in their zeal, should remember that while they are thus striving to keep people from going down into the water, they are shutting the gates of heaven and hell against all mankind—for if the preposition *eis*, will not take us *into* the water, it will not take one of Adam's race "*eis ouranon*" into heaven nor "*eis geennan*" into hell; for there is no other word ever used before these places, when admission into them is spoken of, but the preposition *eis*.

We shall next attend to his criticism on *en*. This preposition is rendered in one hundred times for once by any other word. It occurs nearly two hundred times in the evangelist Mathew. Mr. C. finds one or two places where it *may* be translated *at*, and therefore *must* always be translated *at* where baptismal waters are spoken of. Thus Edwards and he render the phrase, (*en to Jordane*,) *at* Jordan, and "*en to Jordane potamo*" *at* the river Jordan. Excellent critics! Thus they have got two prepositions, the one signifying *motion*, and the other

rest, the one signifying *into*, and the other *in*, to signify *at*, always when baptism is spoken of. Why then, have we two prepositions *eis* and *en*, applied to water, when the idea was neither *into* nor *in*, but only *at*.—According to these learned critics: when a person is *in* the grave, he is only *at* it; when he is *in* the house, he is only *at* the door; when he is *in* bed he is only *at* the side of it; when a ship is *in* the sea, it is only *at* the shore; and when a man is drowned *in* a river, he is drowned *at* the edge of it. O bigotry! O prejudice!—Not Egyptian darkness, was half so fatal to Egyptian eyes, as thy sable sceptre to the eyes of the mind. The preposition *ek*, out of, shares the same fate from the hand of the pedo-baptist critics. If they had diligently enquired, they might have found it also once translated *at*, in the New Testament—Math. 20, 22. Then we would have *at* instead of all prepositions. Thus, instead of, “he came up *out of* the water,” we would have, “he came up *at* the water.” But these wise men prefer *from* as the English of *ex*, and thus make it synonymous with *apo*, from. The Greeks were very philosophical in the use of words, and paid more attention to the use of particles than any other people.

I will transcribe from the most celebrated Greek Grammar in Scotland, a few remarks on these prepositions *eis*, *en*, *ex* and *apo*. “*Eis* denotes motion to a certain place; for the most part so that what is advancing may be *within* that place.” “*En* denotes that something is contained *within a certain and limited place*.” “*Ex* or *ek* denotes that a person departs *out of* a place; or that any thing is taken *out of* any other thing.” “*Apo* denotes the departure, or the distance of one person or thing, from the place of another.” Such are the interpretations of these four prepositions with regard to their classical import, given by the very learned James Moor, L. L. D. professor of Greek in the university of Glasgow, and a member of the Kirk of Scotland. Moor’s Greek Grammar, Appendix, pages 55, 56, 57, 62, ninth edition. All translators and commentators agree in the following remark, viz. To depart from the natural and obvious meaning of any word, where there is not an absolute necessity to make sense with some other word, is contrary to all sound interpretation, and is an inlet to sophistry of the most pernicious tendency. From this species of sophistry,

There is not one pædo-baptist writer on this subject, that can be exempted. They are guilty, every one guilty of it; and most of them to an alarming degree.

We are informed in the Acts of the Apostles, that when the jailor and his household were baptized, "he rejoiced believing in God with all his house." To elude the force of this testimony in favor of the members of the jailor's house having believed, some pædo-baptist writers have said that the phrase "*with all his house*," might have been more correctly rendered "*in all his house*"—i. e. that he walked or ran through all his house rejoicing. This is designed to exclude his family from any participation in his faith or joy; so that it might appear that they were all infants. On this phrase, or rather word, I will subjoin a criticism from an eminent critic: "The adverb *panoiki* (of *pas* all, and *oikos* house) is rightly rendered *with all his house*; for in this sense the LXX. use that word in Exodus 1, 1. "Now these are the names of the children of Israel, which came into Egypt, every man (*panoiki*) and his house, or *with all his house*." Josephus also speaking of the law respecting the offerings allotted for the priest's maintenance, says it was appointed, "that they (*panoiki*) *with their whole families*, might eat them in the holy city." Antig. C. 4, ch. 4, § 4.

In addition to what I have already said on the households baptized, I beg leave to finish this article with a brief, but comprehensive reply to the argument of the pædo-baptists drawn from these households. It is extracted from a treatise, published by Archibald McClean, Edinburgh, the founder of a large and eminent Baptist Church in that city, and whose works were instrumental in bringing some of the most distinguished pædo-baptists in Scotland, to cast their infant sprinkling to the moles and the bats, and to follow the examples recorded in the New Testament—it is as follows:

"We read that Lydia was baptized, and "her household;" that the jailor was baptized, "he and all his, straightway;" and that "Paul baptized also the household of Stephanas." These passages are urged as exhibiting examples of baptizing infants, taking it for granted that these houses contained infants, who were baptized upon the faith of their parents.

“But this is only begging the question in debate. It must first be proved that there were infants in the houses mentioned, for there are many houses without them: and though this were done, which it never can, it still remains to be proved that they were baptized; for the universal expression *all the house* sometimes signifies only the *adult part* of it. Judges 9, 6, “And all the men of Shechem gathered together, and *all the house* of Millo, and went and made Abimelech king.” But the scripture account of these baptized households demonstrates that they are not infants. *All the house* of Cornelius *feared God*, and received the Holy Ghost—Lydia’s household were “*comforted as brethren*”—the word of the Lord *was spoken to all* in the jailor’s house, and they *all rejoiced*, believing in God, as well as himself—*all the house* of Crispus *believed* on the Lord, and the house of Stephanas *addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints*. Now if these things, which are affirmed of *all the baptized*, will not apply to infants, then it is plain there were no infants baptized in these houses.”

No. 2

THE COVENANTS.

BERITH, in the Hebrew language, Diatheke, in Greek, Foedus in the Latin, and Covenant in the English, represent the same idea. These words, though used to express the same idea in those languages, are in some respects different in meaning from one another. Berith primarily signifies a purification sacrifice, a choosing, or friendly parting; and is the word uniformly used in the Old Testament for covenant. Diatheke signifies a disposition, appointment, testament, covenant or dispensation—and is translated into Latin by foedus, testamentum, dispositio. Covenant signifies, from its etymology, to come together, to agree—or a coming together, an agreement. Because sacrifice and a friendly parting were the circumstances of covenant transactions, Berith became metaphorically a suitable name for such transac-

tions. And because there was something appointed, dispensed, guaranteed or established in such interviews, *Diatheke* became a proper expression of the transaction.—And because the parties agreed and parted in a friendly manner, the term *covenant* became a suitable name for it. The word *testament* is often used for it, because of its being the usual name for the will, disposition, or arrangement of the testator's effects, which is rendered valid by his death—the term *dispensation*, so much in use, is also a very suitable term says Parkhurst, and with him I perfectly agree, for a constitution or dispensation is as expressive of the received sense of the term *Diatheke*, as any word in our language.

I would here observe that Mr. Brown's definition of a covenant, in his catechism, is not correctly true as applied to the divine covenants. It may apply to human covenants. "A covenant," saith he, "is an agreement between different parties on certain terms." This is that erroneous opinion which Mr. Parkhurst in his Dictionary mentions, under the word *Diatheke*, that has been built upon rendering this word *covenant* so generally, viz. "As if polluted guilty man could *covenant* or contract with God, for his salvation; or had any thing else to do in this matter, but humbly to *submit* and accept of God's dispensation of purification and salvation through the all atoning sacrifice of the real Berith or purifier, Christ Jesus." The divine Covenants are, sometimes, called *commands* in the sacred scriptures, to denote the authority which institutes them, and the duties they obligate to perform—they are sometimes called *promises*, because of the grace and goodness promised or guaranteed to the subjects of them; but a general acquaintance with the various transactions called covenants or testaments in the sacred scriptures, will render these distinctions obvious and striking.

1. *The Covenant with Adam.*

The transaction which took place in Eden betwixt God and Adam, has been long called a covenant—it has not, however, plainly received this name in the Bible.—Some read Hosea 6, 7, to favor this idea, "they like men, (Adam in the original,) have transgressed the covenant." This is the only place in all the scriptures, that alludes

to that transaction, under the term covenant. We have no objection to calling it a covenant, provided the term covenant be understood here, as it is in all those places, where it is used in the scriptures to express the divine covenants or appointments to men. In Genesis 2d and third chapters, it is called a *command*. "And the Lord commanded Adam, saying of every tree, &c."—The particulars of this transaction are the following :

1. A command to Adam requiring obedience, as the tenure of his enjoyment of the felicity in which he was placed.
2. This implied his actual enjoyment of his condition while he was obedient—It was then a promise or guarantee to him of the continuance of life and enjoyment of Eden.
3. The penalty or punishment threatened was his death, and exclusion from bliss—"In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die."
4. The token or seal of this transaction was the tree of life, which was to him a token and formal guarantee that life would be enjoyed, on condition of his obedience.

Upon the whole premises we must observe, that in this whole transaction, Adam was entirely passive. He stipulated nothing. He acceded to every thing which God proposed. The sovereignty and absolute dominion of God and the absolute dependence of Adam, is clearly asserted in it. It was then purely a dispensation or constitution of things wholly of God, and was not, as Brown of Haddington says, "an agreement between different parties on certain terms"—Adam proposed no terms, and was never asked whether or not he agreed to the Divine command. If Adam in paradise was thus treated as a needy dependent and absolutely at the disposal of his creator, without the liberty of stipulating any thing, shall we, or can we suppose, that, at any period, subsequent to the fall, any man could enter into covenant with his maker, as one man enters into covenant with another !

2. *The Covenant with Noah.*

The next Covenant, or dispensation of things, of which we read, was 1650 years subsequent to man's violation of

the command in Eden. It was established with Noah, and is called "the Covenant or Dispensation of day and night," Jeremiah 33, 20—the peculiarities of which are as follow.

Noah, as Adam, was the father of a world, and the founder of the Post-diluvian, as Adam was of the Antidiluvian world. It was as necessary that Noah should have a guarantee of the continuation of that state, in which he was after the deluge, for the future settlement and cultivation of the earth; as that Adam should have a guarantee of his continuance in Eden, for the enjoyment of it.

This Covenant we have recorded Gen. 9 14, "I establish my covenant with you and with your seed after you, and with every living creature that is with you, of the fowl, and of the cattle, and of every beast of the earth with you, from all that go out of the ark, to every beast of the earth. And I will establish my Covenant with you: neither shall all flesh be cut-off any more with the waters of a flood: neither shall there be any more a flood to destroy the earth. And God said, this is the token of a covenant which I make between me and you, and every living creature that is with you, for perpetual generations. I do set my bow in the cloud, and it shall be for a token of a covenant between me and the earth." Verse 16, "And the bow shall be in the cloud: and I will look upon it, that I may remember the everlasting covenant between God and every living creature of all flesh that is upon the earth." An intimation of this covenant we have in the 22d verse of the preceding chapter, on which the whole covenant is predicated, viz: "While the earth remaineth, seed-time and harvest, and cold and heat, and summer and winter, and day and night, shall not cease." On this covenant observe the following particulars:

1. It was a sovereign act of the Almighty, originating in him, and ordained by him alone.
2. It respected the whole animal creation, as well as the human family, and all of them without any difference.
3. It was absolute and unconditional, consequently could not be broken.
4. It was all promise and no command; also the blessings promised were temporal, and commensurate with time.

8. The token of it was the rainbow, which is merely a memorial of it.*

This Covenant will not correspond with the opinion of Mr. Brown, nor with many of our modern definitions. There was no stipulating on the part of Noah, on the part of the birds, beasts, and fishes; and yet they were what is commonly called a *party* in this transaction. It was then a dispensation, or constitution of things, and possessed all the ideas comprehended under the term *Dia-theke*. It produced a divine confidence in the mind of Noah, which is sometimes the import of *Berith*, and therefore is as properly called covenant, as any of those transactions so called in the scripture.

3. *'The Covenant confirmed of God in Christ.'*

This covenant was first confirmed to Abraham in the year of the world 2083; just 427 years after the Flood, and 430 years before the giving of the law. For thus fixing the date of this transaction, I have the authority of the Apostle—Gal. 3, 8-17. In the 8th verse, he quotes Gen. 12, 3—"In thee shall all families of the earth be blessed." This he calls "*the Gospel preached to Abraham*." He reasons upon it to the 17th verse, shewing that the Gentiles were included in this promise, and calls it "*the Covenant confirmed of God in (relation to) Christ*," 430 years before the giving of the law. There were two promises given to Abraham at this time; the one respecting his natural offspring, "I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee and make thy name

* Some sceptics have objected against the rainbow's being a token of any such transaction, as it is the constant effect of a natural cause, the contraposition of the Sun and a cloud; consequently, must have existed previous to the flood. On this objection, I shall suggest an opinion of my own, viz. that there never was a shower of rain before the deluge, that the earth was watered by a mist; and, therefore, the temperature of the weather was uniformly mild, and the fertility of the earth incomparably greater than at present. I have some slight scripture authority for this opinion—Gen. 2, 5-6, "The Lord God had not caused it to rain upon the earth, but there went up a mist from the earth and watered the whole face of the ground." I have other documents for the above opinion, which this occasion will not permit me to suggest. Let those sceptics prove that there was rain before the flood—I say there was not.

great:" the other, respecting *the seed Christ*, in whom all families of the earth, Jews and Gentiles, should be blessed. This is the promise which had respect to Christ, which the Apostle Paul designates as I have above cited. That this covenant was confirmed 430 years before the giving of the law, is abundantly obvious from the following facts.

Abraham was 75 years old when he departed out of Haran, Gen. 12, 4. He was 100 years old when Isaac was born unto him, and his seed was to be afflicted, or in a sojourning state, 400 years. Gen. 15, 13, compared with Acts 7, 6—"His seed should sojourn in a strange land, that they should bring them into bondage, and evil-entreat them 400 years."—We have now ascertained 425 years of the 430. Whence, then, are we to obtain the other five? I say, five years before Abraham left Haran. Perhaps I might have said before he left Ur of the Chaldees, previous to his coming into Haran—for the first verse of Gen. 12 reads thus, "Now the Lord *had said* unto Abraham," the things following 2 and 3 verses. The time in which these things were spoken is previous to his departure.

In the debate with Mr. Walker, I chose rather to say 25 years in all those places where I spoke of the interval between this covenant and that of circumcision, because that could not be disputed, as we had the age of Abraham when leaving Haran, and when Isaac was born. I then felt as conscious as I now do, that the interval was thirty years. One thing is certain, that 430 years was the period of the sojourning—Exodus 12, 40, "The whole sojourning of the children of Israel was 430 years"—verse 41, "And it came to pass at the end of 430 years, even the self-same day it came to pass, that all the hosts of the Lord went out of Egypt." Three months after they left the land of Egypt, they received the law, Ex. 19, 1. So that Moses, Stephen the proto-martyr, and Paul the Apostle, concur in fixing the above dates. The only question that requires a moment's reflection is, Whether shall we place the five years before Abraham's leaving Haran, or say that it was 405 years from the birth of Isaac till the expiration of the 430 years. Although in the hurry of the debate I once said 405 years from the birth of Isaac till the giving of the law, and have faithfully recorded as I spoke. But I choose rather, from the 1st

verse of the 12th chapter of Genesis, to say that the five years are to be placed *before* Abraham's departure from Haran; and thus leave the round period of the sojourning of his seed 400 years, according to Gen. 15, 13.

Wishing to furnish the most satisfactory evidence on the date of this covenant, I just now, for the first time, on this subject, consulted the best chronological table published in Europe, which is to be found in some editions of Johnson's English dictionary. I am happy to find, that the dates I have already fixed, perfectly coincide with those in the table. The article in the table reads as follows—"The covenant of God made with Abraham when he leaves Haran to go into Canaan *which begins the 430 years' sojourning*, was in the year 1921 before Christ," 427 years after the flood. In the same table, which was made with the utmost care from the dates we have in the scriptures, we have the following article: "Moses performs a number of miracles in Egypt, and departs from that kingdom, together with 600,000 Israelites, besides children, which completed the 430 years sojourning before Christ 1491 years.

I have, then, clearly fixed the date of the confirmation of this covenant with Abraham to be 430 years before the giving of the law, and 50 years before the covenant of circumcision. "Now," saith the Apostle, in relation to this very covenant, Gal. 3, 15, "If it be but a man's covenant, yet if it be confirmed, no man disannulleth or addeth thereto." Consequently no man can, agreeable to this scripture, add circumcision to this covenant; or suppose that circumcision was a seal or token of it.—Some may enquire, why I should be at so much pains to establish the date of the confirmation of this covenant—I answer, this being established, the whole system of Pedobaptists tumbles to the ground. For their arguments from circumcision are all predicated upon circumcision having been a seal of the Covenant of Grace, or of Christ; which I have now irrefragably proved to be a mistake; for the Covenant of Circumcision, and the Covenant of Christ, or new Covenant, are as distinct as any two events thirty years apart can be.

The peculiarities of this covenant were as follow:

1. It exclusively respected Gospel blessings, Paul calls it "*the Gospel*" quoting the words of the covenant Gal. 3, 8. It had a respect to Christ and his seed alone.

2. Men of all nations were its object. "All families of the earth: Jews and Gentiles." Paul calls it "the blessing of Abraham coming upon the Gentiles." A blessing that is enjoyed through Christ alone.

3. The blessings of it are enjoyed by faith; justification, pardon, sanctification, and all the graces of the spirit can only be received and enjoyed by faith. No person can inherit any of the blessings of this covenant by natural birth, the subjects of it are all born from above.

4. There is no condition in it, therefore it cannot be broken. The things proposed in it were all to be accomplished by God and not by man; consequently, not one of them could fail of completion. "All families of the earth shall be blessed."

5. Christ was born "to perform the mercy promised by the Father, and to remember his holy covenant."—Luke 1-72—The only confirmation which this covenant had at the time in which it was said to have been confirmed was the immutable promise of God. When this promise was accomplished it was called the New Covenant or Testament of Christ. Under the term New Covenant, I shall enlarge still further upon it. In the mean time I proceed to observe a few things on the 4th Covenant in the order of Revelation, viz.

4. *The Covenant of Circumcision.*

This covenant was established immediately after the birth of Isaac. Isaac was born 30 years after the Covenant of spiritual blessings was confirmed of God in (relation to) Christ.

This was one step in the providence of God, to the accomplishment of the promise of blessing all nations in the seed of Abraham. This covenant of circumcision, so called by Stephen, Acts 7, in consequence of that rite, grew out of the covenant confirmed 30 years before.—

This was designed to identify and to separate the Jews from all the world, until the promised seed should come. It was to be early stamped upon the flesh of each male child, before he could mingle with the world, so that his pedigree might never be in dispute. The peculiarities of this covenant I shall briefly specify.

1. It was confined to one man's family alone. It belonged to Abraham's seed and to their servants, as a part of their property, and to no other people on earth. "Every man child *among you* shall be circumcised."

2. Natural connexion with Abraham was the ground of claim or interest in it.

3. Its promised blessings were *temporal*—every one temporal.

1. That they should be a numerous and powerful people.

2. That they should inherit the land of Canaan for a perpetual possession.

3. That God would stand in a particular relation to them above all people; in the way of reigning over them, protecting, and blessing them with the bounties of his providence. But that he would be a God to them in this, or any sense, was altogether temporary—or while they kept the covenant, for

4. It was *conditional*. The enjoyment of all these blessings depended upon their obedience—"If ye be willing and obedient ye shall eat the good of the land," and the "uncircumcised man-child hath *broken* my covenant"—when any covenant is broken, or can be broken, it is owing to some condition in it. See Gen. 17 throughout.*

5. It was a covenant in *the flesh*, and *not in the spirit*. "My covenant shall be in *your flesh*," Gen. 17, 13.

The rite of circumcision was the seal of this covenant.

But as I have already enlarged upon this covenant in the preceding debate, I proceed to the next covenant, recorded Exodus 19 and 20, viz.

5. *The Covenant with all Israel at Sinai.*

This Covenant was made with all Israel 400 years after the Covenant of Circumcision, and 1491 years before Christ.

1. It was the accomplishment of the Covenant of Circumcision in two respects; first, Isaac's seed had

* Whatever spiritual blessings any of the Jews enjoyed under that covenant, they were enjoyed through the first promise of covenant confirmed of God in Christ.

multiplied in the family of Jacob, and in the house of bondage, to the number of 600,000 men of war, besides the children and the superannuated. Secondly, they were about to enter into the land of Canaan, and were on their journey for that purpose. It was a developement and a more enlarged edition of the Covenant of Circumcision.

It began with a conditional particle IF. Ex. 19, 5, "Now therefore IF ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar people unto me above all people, for all the earth is mine." It was then **CONDITIONAL**. The people all consented, and acceded to whatever might be commanded them, and all the people answered together and said, "*all that the Lord hath spoken will we do.*" Ex. 19, 8.

3. This covenant was written upon two tables of stone called by the Apostle Paul, Heb. 9, 4, "the tables of the Covenant." Many laws besides these ten commandments, or two tables of the covenant, were given with them at the same time, as appendages of the covenant. But when we speak of the Sinai covenant, we cannot scripturally include one word more in it, than what was written on the two tables, seeing both Moses and Paul have so defined and restricted it. As this is not generally attended to, I shall be at a little pains to enforce and illustrate it.

Deuteronomy 10, 4, "And he wrote on the tables, according to the first writing, the ten commandments, which the Lord spake unto you in the mount"—verse 5, "And I put the tables in the ark which I had made." Now the only law ever deposited in this sacred ark was the tables of the law; and this ark is called the "*Ark of the Covenant.*" Consequently it contained the covenant; and as it contained not another word than the ten commandments, it follows, incontrovertibly, that the ten commandments were the Sinai covenant. But we have a testimony that requires not to be reasoned on, which fully proves, that the whole covenant was written upon the tables deposited in the ark of the covenant—Ex. 34, 28, "*And he wrote upon the tables the words of the covenant, the ten commandments.*"

Now as the ten commandments were emphatically the *Covenant* which God made with Israel at Sinai, and

which was prefaced by a conditional clause, it follows that there was nothing of Christ in the Sinai Covenant. The law of types and ceremonies, which was appended to it, was all Gospel, or all emblematical of Christ and his work; but this must ever be viewed, not as any part of that Sinai Covenant, but as the ordinances of religious worship instituted *under* that covenant, and for no other people than those who were under that covenant.

4. The laws under this covenant or constitution were very numerous, and two covenants grew out of it. The one respecting the mitre, in the house of Aaron; the other respecting the sceptre, in the house of David. It was by the Sinai covenant that Israel became a holy nation, a peculiar people. It was then a national covenant. God formally by it became the king of Israel, and they, by consenting to the preliminaries, became, in a peculiar sense, *his people*, nationally. This Covenant was then the constitution of the Jewish nation, as the constitution of these United States is the constitution of this nation. The other laws given to Israel were as distinct from the constitution or covenant, as the laws of any state are distinct from the constitution of it.

The constitution of any country is the supreme law of the land. To it must all the laws of the land correspond, and from it they receive their sanction. Thus all the laws of Israel corresponded to their constitution and were sanctioned by it, or by the authority that gave them a constitution.

In one point of view, the constitution and the laws of any country, may be called *the law of the land*. The former, the supreme law; the latter, the subordinate law; and, both together, the law of the land. Hence, the Sinai covenant and all the laws of Israel, are sometimes, in general terms, called *the law*, without any discrimination; thus the phrase *the law*, is used to denote the constitution and the law. In a sense, still more general, the whole Bible is called the law of God; but when the inspired penmen thought it necessary for illustration, they discriminated betwixt the covenant, and the laws enacted under it. For the same reason, it often becomes necessary, in modern times, to view the covenant or constitution of Israel, and their laws under it, as separate and distinct.

5. The Sinai covenant contained both promise and

command. The promise in it was concerning temporal blessings, and was given on a condition. It is found not in the first, but in the second table of the covenant. The fifth commandment, or first of the second table, Paul calls, "the first commandment with promise"—it reads thus: "Honor thy father and thy mother, that thy days may be long in the land, which the Lord thy God giveth thee." Long life in a good land, was the promise of the national covenant, and the condition of its enjoyment—obedience to parents or rendering them the honor due them. Temporal good and conditionally enjoyed, was all the promise of the covenant at Sinai—its commands are by the Apostle called "holy, just, and good"—"the ministration of condemnation—and the ministration of death." 2 Cor. 3, 7, 14, and Rom. 7.

6. This covenant, when read in the audience of the whole Jewish nation, was dedicated or confirmed by blood—"For when Moses had spoken every precept to the people according to the laws, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water and scarlet wool and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book and all the people, saying, *this is the blood of the covenant which God hath enjoined unto you.*"

As this article is not intended to be a treatise upon the covenants, but only to delineate the most prominent features of them, in order to ascertain one important point; I omit insisting upon the office of Moses in this transaction; and some other minor things which have no bearing upon the subject in dispute.

6. *The Covenant of Peace, or concerning the Sacerdotal Office.*

The tribe of Levi was distinguished amongst the twelve, and honored with the office of the Priest, to the exclusion of every other tribe. The family of Aaron, of this tribe, was separated from the rest of their brethren, the Levites, to inherit the high priesthood. It was guaranteed to Aaron and his male issue, by the right of primogeniture, through all generations, by a perpetual covenant.—The peculiarities of this covenant will be clearly seen from two portions of scriptures—Ex. 40, 14-15, "And thou (Moses) shalt put upon Aaron the holy gar-

ments, and anoint him, and sanctify him, that he may minister unto me in the priest's office. And thou shalt bring his sons, and clothe them with coats; and thou shalt anoint them as thou didst anoint their father, that they may minister unto me in the priest's office, for their anointing shall surely be an everlasting priesthood, throughout their generations"—Numbers 25-12-13. Phineas, the son of Eliezer, the son of Aaron, is thus addressed—"Behold" saith God, "I give unto him my covenant of peace. And he shall have it, and his seed after him, even the covenant of an everlasting priesthood."

From these words we observe a few things—

1. It was a sovereign and unsolicited act of the Almighty to confer the high priesthood on the house of Aaron.

2. The Covenant of the priesthood is called "*the covenant of peace.*"

3. This covenant was unconditional as respected any thing on the part of Aaron, or his posterity. Hence Annas and Caiaphas, who condemned, and consented to the death of the Messiah, were high priests, and yet the spirit of God caused one of them to prophecy concerning Christ.

4. This covenant had no other confirmation than the word of God, who cannot lie.

5. It was called an everlasting priesthood, because it was to be commensurate with the existence of the Jewish state.

6. Under this covenant or constitution of things respecting the priesthood, there were many laws regulating sacrifice and the support of the priests, which must be viewed as separate and distinct from the covenant of the priesthood.

7. *Of the Covenant of Royalty with David.*

This Covenant is clearly stated 2d Sam. 7-12-17, in these words, "And when thy (David's) days be fulfilled, and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, I will set up thy seed after thee which shall proceed out of thy bowels, and I will establish his kingdom. He shall build an house for my name and I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever. I will be his father, and he shall be my son—If he commit iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of

men, and with the stripes of the children of men: But my mercy shall not depart away from him, as I took it from Saul, whom I took away before thee. And thy house, and thy kingdom, shall be established before thee forever: thy throne shall be established forever"—Of this covenant the Lord saith, Jer. 33-20-21—"If ye can break my covenant of the day, and my covenant of the night, and that there should not be day and night, in their season—then shall also my covenant with David my servant be broken, that he should not have a son to sit upon his throne."—On this covenant observe,

1. It was a sovereign act of God in choosing David.
2. The throne and sceptre were promised to him unconditionally.
3. This covenant could not be broken.
4. It was all promise, but its blessings were temporal, a throne, a sceptre, a kingdom, and heirs.
5. It had no seal or confirmation, but the *oath* of God.
6. It continued until Shiloh came, for then the sceptre was departing from Judah—but Christ, David's son, and David's Lord, hath been seated on the throne of Glory; and

"Thence extends his sceptred hand,
And sways creation's ample bounds."

Thus have I briefly noticed the grand outlines of the seven Covenants or dispensations of things, previous to the Christian Era; from all which we learn the following things:—

1. That, commands, promises, appointments, and ordinances of God, are equally called covenants. Hence the term covenant signifies an appointment, a constitution, or dispensation.

2. That, every covenant is a gift originating in the sovereign and independent mind of God. That he only bestows, and we only receive; *we never stipulate.*

3. That, all covenants which have conditions in them are subject to be broken, *but those that are unconditional, cannot be broken.*

4. That, of the covenants which we have specified, three only could be broken, *and these three were broken, viz.—*The covenant with Adam, the covenant of circumcision, and the covenant at Sinai. But the covenant of day and night with Noah—the covenant confirmed of

of God in Christ, the covenant of the mitre, and that of the sceptre, could not be broken.

5. That, of the unconditional covenants, two ran out, viz.—The covenant of the priesthood and the covenant of royalty. These were to be co-existent with the Jewish state; and when that expired, they of course expired with it. Moreover, these were emblematical of the priesthood and royalty of the Messiah, and when he was invested with the offices of priest and king, as the only mediator betwixt God and man, the man Christ Jesus, these were of no consequence; they were as the shell when the kernel is extracted.

6. Of the remaining two unconditional covenants, one only is spiritual, and strictly everlasting, viz. the covenant of blessing all families in Christ. The covenant of day and night, will expire when time shall be no longer; it was only to be commensurate with time. But the covenant of God in Christ will, in its actual accomplishment, *remain for ever and ever*: the enjoyment of its blessings will be commensurate with eternity.

7. Four of these seven covenants, viz. the circumcision—the two tables—the priesthood—and the royalty, being given to, and belonging to the children of the flesh, or natural seed of Abraham, as such; are often viewed as one grand dispensation of things, and together called, “*the dispensation of the law*,” because of their being inseparably connected in forming one great typical nation, and having a reciprocal bearing on one another. Hence, in the New Testament, they are always called *the law*, except for some particular purpose, a discrimination becomes necessary. Then we read of “*the covenant of circumcision*,” of “*the tables of the covenant*,” of the “*priesthood of Aaron*” and of “*the royalty of David*.”

8. Under the four last mentioned covenants, all their blessings were enjoyed by *natural birth*. Every male child was circumcised and entitled to the blessings of the circumcision, because he was of Jewish parents. Their being wicked could not deprive their children of this blessing. Every Levite by birth was to inherit all the peculiar blessings of the house of Levi—every first-born son in the house of Aaron, in the elder branch of the family, was born *high priest*, if he was *compos corporis*. Every first-born son in the house of David for the most part was born a king, whether a wise man or a fool—and

every first born of man and beast was born dedicated to the Lord. The fleshly birth alone qualified them for the enjoyment of all these blessings.—This is an insuperable evidence that these blessings were not spiritual, but merely temporal.*

9. In regard of the seals of these covenants we have to observe, that the word *seal* is no where applied to any of them in the Bible. In exhibiting the grand outlines of these seven covenants, where I found any thing that had received the name of *seal*, I gave it that name in accommodation to the common apprehension of these things—but I did it with the design of reviewing the term, and its usage, in this connection of ideas. But three of them had any thing answering to that which is called a *seal*. Before I proceed any further in my remarks on this term, I shall define it. In Johnson's dictionary it is thus defined—"a stamp; a confirmation." Walker defines it "a stamp engraved with a peculiar impression, which is fixed upon the wax that closes a letter, or affixed as a testimony;—any act of confirmation."—On consulting Parkhurst, Doctor Campbell, Cruden, Stockius, and other classical authorities, I discover that the term *sphragis*, *sigillum*, usually translated *seal*, and which is the word used Rom. 4, 11, denotes a *confirmative* mark, a *security*, an *attestation*, the act of secreting any thing. Of these, the phrase *confirmative* mark, is that which expresses the force of the word, in regard to any covenant transaction betwixt man and man. Thus the seal of state is an expression of the confirmation of that to which it

* Notwithstanding it has been and may be justly asserted, that the blessings, the privileges, or good things promised in six of these covenants were external, earthly, and temporal goods; the fullest possible enjoyment of which, would have amounted to no more than a happy life in this world, under the Divine government; yet it by no means follows, that it is denied that spiritual blessings were enjoyed by many saints under the Jewish dispensation; and before the Jewish dispensation, even in the Patriarchal age. But the spiritual blessings enjoyed in the Patriarchal age, and during the Jewish age, were enjoyed by faith in the promise concerning Christ, first intimated to Adam, and given to Abraham, in the covenant of God in Christ. For all spiritual blessings have ever flowed in the same channel, and have ever been enjoyed on the same footing. The Gospel was exhibited to the Jews in many types, and such of them only as understood and believed in the great antitype enjoyed spiritual blessings.

is affixed. Thus when men have signed and sealed any instrument, the seal attached to it is an evidence of the confirmation of it. Such is the meaning that every body that knows the meaning of the word affixes to it. We shall then use it as defined by these authorities, and, in respect of a covenant transaction, the only meaning that is applicable is the first mentioned, viz. *an act of confirmation exhibited in some standing mark or token.*

In the proper and federal use of the term, it can have no other meaning than the above, or that it is some external mark, sign, or token, affixed to such a transaction, which may be seen and adduced as an evidence in *perpetuam rei memoriam*, by which the validity of the deed, record or transaction, may be ascertained or evinced in all time coming for the security and satisfaction of all concerned during the stipulated continuance of said deed or charter. But does it thence follow that every confirmatory rite may be justly denominated a *seal*; such as giving the right hand, subscribing one's name, giving a piece of money as the earnest for the full payment of the stipulated sum at the time appointed, or interposing the solemnity of an oath for the performance of a promise. We may make what use we please of terms, but surely to give to any of the above confirmative rites the denomination of a *seal*, would be an abuse of the term. If we wish to be clearly understood, and not to mislead, let us call things by their proper names. This is doubly necessary, when we use terms that are not found in the scriptures, in relation to those scriptural subjects to which we may please to apply them.

Three only of the covenants had seals attached to them, in the true sense of the word, viz. the Covenant with Adam, which had the standing seal of *the tree of life*—the Covenant of Day and Night, with Noah, which had the standing seal or token of *the rainbow*; and the Covenant of Circumcision, which left a standing mark *in the flesh*—“*in perpetuam rei memoriam*,” in continual remembrance of the thing. These tokens attached to these covenants were truly seals, or *marks of confirmation*; visible and evincive of the thing. These, like the *stamp or seal* of the state, were visible confirmative marks, which were declarative of the thing.—With regard to the use of *seals* we may enquire, Who is to use them? I answer, none but those who can confirm the covenant—*for*

the sealing is the act of confirming, and the *seal* is the confirmative mark—God alone can confirm his own covenants, and therefore *he alone* can seal them. If there be any condition in the covenant in the first instance, requiring the immediate consent of the parties, then it is necessary that both parties should sign it, as between man and man; but if one of the parties cannot confirm, and therefore cannot *seal*, he must make the required *mark* which will shew his consent—and this was the case with regard to Circumcision. He, only, who has the ability to execute and accomplish, can confirm or seal; and therefore, he that proposes to execute any thing, must first be supposed to be competent; otherwise, his sealing the transaction can afford no security to others that it will be accomplished. Every seal is entitled to as much credit as the character or state merits whose seal it is. The sole intention of affixing a seal, is to inspire confidence in those who are interested in the transaction. The object of those seals which the Almighty has affixed to certain transactions, was solely to inspire and confirm confidence. To answer such a question as that which Abraham once proposed for his own personal satisfaction and confidence, “Lord God how shall I know that I shall inherit?” the Lord God confirmed, by a particular interview, the faith of Abraham, and inspired him with confidence that God would make a covenant with his seed and execute it.—Gen. 15.

The ratification or dedication of the covenant with Israel at Sinai, by the sprinkling of blood, was an act confirmative of their faith; yet it cannot, in strict propriety, be called a *seal*, any more than the oath or promise of God can be called a seal; though either of them may be, and actually is, confirmative of the faith of saints. The ratification of the covenant at Sinai, was emblematical of the ratification of the New Testament, by the blood of the Surety. Under the New Testament, the only seal is that *mark* or *impression* which the spirit of God makes upon the heart or soul of the believer; because the objects of this covenant are *personally* and not *nationally* considered. The object of *this seal* is the personal satisfaction of the individual, and not an external mark set upon him for the confirmation of others, as circumcision was designed more for the satisfaction of others than for the subject of it; to convince the world that God had actually fulfilled

his covenant, in raising up a saviour in the family of Abraham. Hence *the seal* which is stamped under the New Testament, is altogether confirmative of the faith of the subject, and is beautifully described in these words:—*“To him that overcometh, will I give of the hidden manna, and will give him a white stone, and in the stone a name written which no man knoweth, saving he that receiveth it.”*

The only *seal* spoken of in the New Testament as the guarantee and property of all Christians, is *“this seal of the holy spirit.”* Neither baptism nor the Lord’s supper are ever so called, nor can they be so called, in conformity to the meaning of words; yet we admit that they are both confirmative of the faith and hope of the Christian. These ordinances have been for a long time called *“seals of the covenant of grace:”* with what propriety, I confess, I never yet could see; one thing is certain, there is no authority from the scriptures for so calling them. Nor can I understand how any human being could use them as seals, or as *“sealing ordinances.”* I should be glad to see a scriptural and rational explanation of them as such. I do not wish to derogate, nor do I, in my opinion, derogate any thing from either their solemnity or importance, by saying, that I do not conceive how they can be called sealing ordinances. Baptism is an ordinance by which we formally profess Christianity. It is the first constitutional act in the profession of Christianity. It confirms nothing in the covenant of Christ, that was not confirmed before. It is no stamp, nor confirmative mark, of that covenant, for it was ratified by the blood of Christ. The baptized person carries no mark, no seal of confirmation, that is visible to himself, or to others, in consequence of his obedience to this rite. The Lord’s Supper is commemorative of the death of Christ, and an expression of our faith in his atoning sacrifice, by which he has made peace, and by which we enjoy the peace of God in our hearts. It confirms our faith, it promotes our love, it cherishes our hope, and produces benevolence and brotherly kindness. But our participation of it confirms nothing in the covenant of Christ, that was not confirmed before. We might, with as much propriety, call all the ordinances of the Gospel, *seals of the Covenant of Grace*, as these. The whole blessings of this covenant, have been as fully enjoyed by many who be-

now in Heaven, who could not, who did not, receive those ordinances, as by any other saints in Heaven or in earth. The thief upon the cross, had as full an enjoyment of them, as any other in ancient or modern times. And many, both under the Patriarchal and Christian age, have had all the blessings of redemption as fully bestowed upon them, as any who have been baptized, and have participated of the Lord's Supper. Now if baptism and the Lord's supper, were the seals of this covenant, it would follow, that they who never had received them, were deprived of the security, for the enjoyment of this covenant; and, of course, had no confirmation of it to them. How much more rationally does the Apostle speak of that seal, which all true Christians enjoy—Eph. 1, 13, "In whom also, after that ye believed ye were SEALED with that holy spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession, unto the praise of his glory." On these words let it be observed,

1. That all believers, after believing the Gospel, are sealed by the holy spirit.
2. That this seal, or impression of the spirit, is their sole earnest or pledge, until they enter into the enjoyment of the inheritance of the saints.
3. That this seal is a sufficient guarantee and earnest, and requires not any external ordinance to perfect it.

This testimony is further confirmed by the same Apostle, and in the same epistle, Ep. 4, 30: "Grieve not the holy spirit of God whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption."

So full, so uniform, in his testimony, and so explicit, is the Apostle, upon this topic, that in his Epistle to the Corinthians, 2 Ep. 1-22, he expresses it very clearly, in these words: "God who hath also sealed us and given us the earnest of the spirit in our hearts." This inward mark, or seal, is explained to be an impressing of the image of him, who hath created us anew—Col. 3, 10.

Such is the seal of which the New Testament speaks. This is sufficient without our factitious seals, which at best are a prostitution of language, unwarrantable in the highest degree, and tending to perplex and confuse, rather than to enlighten or compose the mind of the Christian.

I am sorry that my present opportunity forbids me to

enter into a full discussion of this subject. I have only introduced it—but what has been said, is designed to cause the reader to reflect and examine for himself. The subject on which I write, is established independent of these views, and requires not any thing far fetched to support it.

I expect to hear it said, that I have denied the seals of the Covenants of Grace, to maintain my cause—yet the truth is, I have merely volunteered these remarks. My views are established long since, in respect of the subject under discussion—and I deny not, but contend for the *true seal* of the covenant of Christ—which, I maintain, in a few words, *to have ever been the same in substance, and never to have had any other seal, than that of the Spirit.* I call upon them, who say that baptism and the Lord's supper are the seals of the New Covenant, to prove it—and I will then engage to prove, in a more systematic way, that *they are not.* I will prove that the covenant of Christ, or of Grace, has ever been the same, and that its only seal, in all ages, was the impression of the spirit on the minds of the faithful—That if the Lord's supper was a seal of it, and to be used as such, it would be the most unmeaning thing in the world, ever to use it more than once.

10. I have only to observe further, of the Covenants, that the refusal of the subjects of such of them as were conditional, to be obedient to them, and the open violation of them, has ever merited from the Almighty the severest vengeance; and that the consequences resulting from transgression of them, do not cease with the violation of them, or when a new state of things is introduced—thus we all experience, to this day, the effects of Adam's violation of that covenant under which he was at first placed. And the whole Jewish nation, to this day, feel the sad effects of the violation of the Sinai covenant by their fathers. “For the gifts and callings of God are without repentance.”

The New Covenant.

The New Testament or Covenant, is the only one that intimately concerns us to understand—it is that which the Apostles labored to explain—it is the only one published since the birth of the Messiah—it accomplishes and

fully exhibits, that, confirmed of God in Christ, 430 years before the Sinai covenant. Of it, Paul says, he and his associates were made *able ministers*. He speaks of the superiority of it to the old covenant, at sundry times, and in diverse respects. The Covenant of Circumcision was to the Covenant at Sinai, what the Covenant of God in relation to Christ promised to Abraham, is to the New Testament—a full and luminous development of it.

From what Paul alone says of this covenant, in the 3d chap. to the Corinthians, 2d Epis. Gal. 3, and Heb. 8, 9, and 10 chaps. we are authorised to say, that it “*excelleth in glory*,” in respect of its promises, its subjects, its seal, its mediation, and its duration. The most brilliant discoveries, the most splendid appendages, and the most august circumstances connected with the Jewish covenants, were but feeble types of it, and had “*no glory by reason of the glory that excelleth*.” It was devised in eternity—eternal life was promised, in relation to it, “*before the world began*”—four thousand years prepared its way, and introduced its establishment. All the lights of four thousand years twinkle into insignificance, when the blaze of its splendor burst forth. When its august mediator appears—the rod of wonders drops from the hand of Moses; the mitre falls from the head of Aaron, and the diadem and sceptre depart from the house of David. When its sacrifice is exhibited, the brazen and the golden altar lose their victims, the golden censor smokes no more, and the sons of Levi no longer minister in sacred emblems. When its promises and its laws are unfolded—no thunder bursts on Sinai, no trembling shakes the ground, no fiery law denounces vengeance; but tongues of seraphs whisper peace. When its worship is instituted—the chosen tribes to Jerusalem’s temple go up no more, the worldly sanctuary not now is thronged with carnal crowds, the bellowing herds and bleating flocks with mingled sounds no longer rend the skies—but social prayers, and united songs of triumph, rise from hearts smit with the love of Zion. When its ordinances are instituted, no bloody rite imbues the administrator’s hand; no bitter herbs accompany its sacred feasts, but from nature’s wide domain the choicest elements distinguish its sacred rites;—water that purifies

and refreshes—bread, the staff of life—and wine, that “cheers the heart of God and man,” emblems of Heaven’s best gift, (Judges, 9, 13.) The spirit of benevolence which it breathes, knows no artificial bounds, it respects not climes nor nations, tribes nor tongues; but embraces in its bosom “the frozen Icelfander and the sun-burned Moor.” Its spirit, is the spirit of love, of sacred awe, and of a sound mind—its zeal is not the infuriated dæmon of religious parties, that oft has gorged itself on blood of human sacrifice; nor is it the child of blinded bigotry nor of wild enthusiasm—it is a true regard for the glory of God and the good of man. Its subjects are not the children of one birth nor those of one particular family—they are twice born, once from above; their nativity and citizenship are in Mount Zion alone. They are not subjects by constraint, but volunteers, a people made willing by the power of the Highest. Their obedience is the obedience of love, for their king accepts no other. Their seal is no external mark imposed by the hands of man, but an impression made, not in the flesh, but in the spirit, *by the finger of God*. The laws by which they are governed, are laws inscribed, not upon tables of stone, nor on paper only, ministered by human hands, but on the living tablets of the heart. The blessings which it conveys, are not surveyed by the sun, nor measured by time—rivers, nor mountains, nor seas, circumscribe them—they transcend the visible creation, they extend beyond the stars, and endure to eternity. The guarantee of them is not the word of man that repents, nor of the son of man that deceives: it is the promise, the oath, and the seal, of the Eternal, who is faithful to execute and omnipotent to accomplish. Blessed are the people that are in such a case; yea, blessed are they whose God the Lord Jehovah is!

For the confirmation of the above, I refer the reader to pages 39 and 40 of the Debate. I request him, also, to compare, for himself, the answers which Mr. Walker gave to my nine questions on the Covenants, with the preceding article; and then to conclude, for himself, how unscriptural, unreasonable, and self-contradictory, the pedo-baptist system is.

No. 3.

ON THE GOOD AND EVIL OF INFANT BAPTISM:

SOME say, that the sprinkling of an infant is a good thing, some say it is an evil thing, and others suppose it to be neither good nor evil, but an innocent unmeaning thing. For my own part, I know of no action of a rational agent, that is not either good or evil in some sense—either naturally or morally good or bad. It is a very pertinent question in relation to every part of our practice, but especially in relation to our religious practice—“What good is in it? Or, What good end will be obtained by it?”

I will then propose the question, What *good* is there in infant sprinkling?—This question I will attempt to answer with the greatest caution. If I were to answer it from the lips of pedo-baptists, I should not know what to say, or which opinion to prefer; for on this subject they are far from agreed amongst themselves: and “fools may differ, when Doctors disagree.”—There are three leading opinions on this subject held by the three grand sects of pedo-baptists—the Church of Rome, the Church of England and the Church of Scotland.* The Church of Rome says, that infant sprinkling forgives sins, and this is a good thing; but the other Pedo-baptists deny this; and so do I. The Church of England calls baptism the “laver of regeneration,” and affirms that it constitutes the subject “a child of God, an heir of Christ, and an inheritor of the kingdom of glory.” The Church of Scotland denies this; and so do I. The Church of Scotland says, that it is a seal of the covenant of grace, and “doth signify and seal our engrafting into Christ, and our engagement to be the Lords.” This I also deny. Some, perhaps, may be so curious as to know on what grounds I oppose these opinions—my reasons are the following:

1st, because the Bible says no such thing; it never mentions infant baptism nor infant sprinkling, consequently

* The Church of Scotland is the same in faith and practice as the General Assembly, or Presbyterian Church.

never points out any advantage resulting from it. Secondly, the above opinions are contrary to fact, and the experience of mankind. Facts are the most cogent reasons, and the most stubborn arguments in the world. Is it a fact, that all infants baptised or sprinkled, have their sins forgiven them, in that rite? Let him that says yes, present his proof. We baptists say that nothing but the blood of Christ forgives sins; and that when any of the sins of any person are forgiven, all his sins shall be forgiven, and himself saved—for the scriptures know nothing of a *partial* forgiveness; and when one sin is forgiven, all the other sins of the individual shall be forgiven. What infant sprinkling is to one infant, it is to all infants that are sprinkled. There is no difference amongst them, they are all by nature alike, and whatever advantage one receives from this tradition, all receive the same. Now of those that are sprinkled, many live to adult years, and lead lives of the most stubborn infidelity and abandoned profligacy, and die as they lived. This is a fact incontrovertible. If, then, their sin or sins previous to sprinkling had been forgiven them, they would have had all their sins forgiven them, and would have led lives quite different. They would have been sanctified as well as pardoned: for pardon, justification, sanctification, and salvation, are inseparably connected. Thus saith the Apostle, Rom. 8, 30: "Whom he called, them he also justified, and whom he justified, them he also glorified." All the graces of salvation are inseparably bestowed.—There is one proposition which I shall here submit; it is an universal negative, viz. There never was, there never will be, a child of Adam lost, that had but one sin of all his sins forgiven him. The converse of which is, that there never was a child of Adam that had one sin forgiven him that had not all his sins forgiven. The reason is, the Almighty does not his work by halves—where he begins to work he finishes. He does not resemble a foolish artificer or mechanic, who begins a piece of workmanship, and after he has blocked it out, or begun to work upon it, throws it away, either from versatility, or incapacity to execute and perfect it. Such are my reasons, or a sample of them at least, for denying that infant sprinkling forgives sins.

Many Pædo-baptists will, doubtless, agree with the preceding remarks against the Romanists' opinion, concern-

ing sprinkling of infants. They will, no doubt, say, as was said of old, "thou answerest discreetly." But I am about to address them, on their views of infant sprinkling, and, no doubt, they will say, "thus saying, thou reproachest us likewise." Well, my friends, the day soon comes, when you will confess, that your monitor is your friend, rather than your panegyrist. I must then tell you; ye that say, that the sprinkling of an infant makes it "a child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of Glory," that your opinion of infant sprinkling is as contradictory to fact as the above. Again, I repeat, whatever sprinkling is to one infant, it is to all infants. This, I presume, none will deny; if they should, I will thank them to shew what sprinkling is to a child that dies, and what it is to one that lives. All I intend to say is, that sprinkling is the same in substance, and confers the same benefit on the child that lives, as it does on the child that dies. I am sure, also, that we must ascertain from those that live, what benefits they received from sprinkling, for we can learn nothing from them that die in infancy. Bear with me, then, ye sons and daughters of the English Hierarchy, while I tell you, that I cannot find in the annals of your sect, nor in the bosom of her wide extended communion, facts sufficient to convince me, that the sprinkling of her members in infancy, has made them "children of God, and inheritors of the kingdom of Glory." What charity, what unbounded charity, would it require, to enable the good people of your communion, to consider that George the 4th and his ministry, with all the branches of the royal family, the principal officers of the Navy and Army, and a thousand other dignified members of your Church, were by sprinkling, in infancy, made children of God, heirs of Christ, and inheritors of the kingdom of Glory!! Methinks I hear you say, in the language of your own liturgy, from "such members," Good Lord deliver us! I do not mean to say, that every individual member of the naval and military establishment, or of the ministry, is a member of the Episcopal Church, or a disgrace to any Church; but, I intend to say, that the nine tenths of them are members of that Church, and a disgrace to any Church—but, perhaps, you will say, I unfairly take a sample of the worst, and argue from it, as if it were true of all. No, my friends, you shall have no such cause of complaint. Let us look around at A, B, C, and D, 18, 19, 20, and 21 years of

age, and ; is it now evident, that these became children of God, in baptism ; nay, verily, if they are now children of God, they will tell you they became so since infancy ; not by sprinkling, but by the regeneration of the spirit of God, by means of the life giving word.—Your views of infant sprinkling, then, when fairly exposed to the test, are found to be as contradictory to fact, and as opposite to the scriptures, as the views of the Romanists on this tradition.

The things which have been written, respecting the views of the two preceding sects, apply, in a great measure, with equal force, against the Presbyterians of Scotland and America—for if, as their confession says, the sprinkled infant “is engrafted into Christ” by sprinkling, then its sins must be forgiven it ; then it must be pardoned and accepted ; for, saith the Apostle, “If any man be in Christ he is a new creature ; old things are passed away, behold all things are become new.” But look around, and what difference do you observe in the boys and girls that have been baptized in infancy, distinguishing them from those that have never been sprinkled. Is there any difference ? No—they are every way similar. Facts will not support your views, nay facts oppose them, and proclaim to you, that you are mistaken. Of those that are *thus* engrafted into Christ, not a fourth part ever sit down at the Lord’s table—not a fourth part so much as profess to be members of Christ’s mystical body. You cannot, then, point out one benefit resulting from infant sprinkling. If you could but bring one fact to justify your views, we might patiently investigate it, and give you due credit for it ; but this cannot be done. In a word then, there is *no good* in infant sprinkling. Those who are sprinkled, are, in no respect, better than those that are not. The unsprinkled infant grows as well, is as healthy, lives as long, becomes as dutiful a child, makes as good a citizen, and if a subject of Divine grace, makes as good a Christian, as the sprinkled child ; and without Divine grace, no person, young or old, can become a Christian. What, then, is the cause of this mighty contest ? What do you propose to yourselves from it ? Do you not see that it becomes a mere engine in the hands of every party, to facilitate its own aggrandizement ? By it the church of Rome secures all born within her dominion ; the church of England and the church of Scotland, secure, by this rite, all within the pale of their respective jurisdictions. Each sect has its own views of it ; but all agree, that the

sprinkled are thereby bound to become members of their respective sects; and are at no little pains, to make them think, that they are under baptismal vows, and formal engagements, to be the Lord's; that is, in the sense of each party, to join it, and be true sons of the church, in which they came under these vows. It is the consummation of, what shall I call it, priestcraft or folly, to teach a youth to consider itself under vows or engagements, from some circumstance that took place, when it was 10 or 15 days old; in which it was as passive, and of which it was as unconscious, as a stone! Yet there are not a few who believe it: well may it be said that the conscience is a creature of circumstances!

Having been able to find *no good* in infant baptism, nor in infant sprinkling, (for I must always consider them as distinct things) I now proceed to enquire—is there any *evil* in it? In answering this question, I desire to be guided by three things only, scripture, reason, and fact—neither by passion nor by prejudice, nor I trust will the fear of the frown of any mortal, ever deter me from declaring the truth on this, or any other topic, on which I am fairly called to express my sentiments. I answer the question now proposed with the utmost coolness & deliberation, & feel no hesitation in declaring, that infant sprinkling is a *manifest evil*. This I shall instance in a few respects.

1st, It is "*will worship*." By the term *will worship*, I understand worship, founded upon the *will* of man and not on the *will* of God. "In vain do they worship me," saith Christ, "teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." The preceding pages shew that the rite of infant sprinkling is as much a tradition of men, as "the *scrutiny*, the *exsufflation*, by which Devils are expelled, the *insufflation*, by which the spirit of God is communicated, the *consecration* of the water, the *chrismal unction*, the *lighted taper*, and the *milk and honey*," which are but seven of the twenty-two appendages, to infant sprinkling made by the Church of Rome. Now as all "*will worship*" is a disparagement on the worship appointed of God, it is consequently a reflexion upon his wisdom, and obnoxious to his displeasure. It is as contrary to his revealed will, as the presenting of "*strange fire*" upon his altar was, in the days of Naidab and Abihu. And indeed every religious practice, which is not founded upon an explicit revelation of the will of heaven is *will worship*. The language of it is—Thou shouldst

have appointed this, and we are supplying a defect in thy wisdom or goodness. Such is the spirit of every innovation in Divine worship.

2d, It has *carnalized* and *secularized* the church more than any other innovation since the first defection in Christianity. The actual tendency of infant sprinkling, is to open the gates of the church as wide as the gates of the world, and to receive into its bosom all that is born of women. That this may appear as obvious as the light of the sun, the reader has only to reflect, that if the pedo-baptist system prevailed, so that all the fathers and mothers in any country, or in all countries, were determined to have their infant offspring "*initiated into the church*" as soon as born, by the rite of sprinkling, then, in that country, or in all countries so acting, the discrimination between the world and the church would be lost; its gates would be as capacious as those of the world, and without the necessity of regeneration, every member of the human family in that region or country, would have a place in the church. About one hundred years ago, the whole kingdom of Scotland, with the exception of, say two or three thousand individuals, was one great pedo-baptist society. In those days the church engrossed all that were born, and initiated them into it. Of course, all the enormities committed in the realm were committed by members of the church; so that none of the apostolic admonitions in which the difference betwixt the church and the world is pointed out, would apply to them.

In the year 1300, and for several centuries before, all the citizens of Germany, France, Spain, England, and indeed all the western Roman Empire, with the exception of a few baptists, were initiated into, what was then called, the church, as soon as the parents could have the rite performed. In those days and while those principles prevailed, the church was secularized, the church and state completely amalgamated; and all the follies and vices of childhood, manhood, and old age, were engrafted upon the stock of Christianity. In those days pedo-baptist principles triumphed, and there never was a period, in which the church was so completely and universally *carnalized* and *secularized*. Let it not be said, that this was owing more to other traditions than to infant baptism or sprinkling; for when we grant that there were many other innovations and traditions besides this,

we must insist that this contributed more than they all, to introduce that awfully corrupt system called anti-christ; to nurture, to mature, and to perfect it.—It introduced *all* good and bad, into the church, and as bad men invented errors, and propagated heresies in the church, we have only to ask how they got in, and then the true cause of the enormous mass of error of those days appears. It is a fact evident from church history, that the prevalence of corruption in the church, bore pace with the prevalence of infant baptism, and the triumphant days of the one, were the triumphant days of the other.

The description we have of the church, in the sacred scriptures, leads us to consider all the members of it as "*a peculiar people*," as born from above, as being all taught of God. Hence we read—"a willing people in the day of thy power will come to thee,"—"all thy children shall be taught of God, and great shall be the peace of thy children"—"Every one that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me,"—"To as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God; even to them that believe on his name; which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God. Power or privilege to become the sons of God, was given to such only, as were born of God." How unlike this to the practice of pedo-baptists, who endeavor to crowd all into the church, which are born, *not of God*, but of the *will of the flesh*, and of the *will of man*. Again, when we read the descriptions given of the churches of the saints in the Epistles, they will not apply to a church that admits all the infants born of the members, to membership. The majority of any such church, must be of a character essentially dissimilar to the following descriptions of the church of Jesus Christ. 1 Cor. 6, 11—"Ye are washed, ye are sanctified, ye are justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the spirit of our God." 2 Thess. 2 13, "Brethren beloved of the Lord, God hath from the beginning, chosen you to salvation, through sanctification of the spirit, and *belief of the truth*." 1 Pet. 25, "Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God by Jesus Christ." 9th verse—"But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a *peculiar people*; that ye should shew forth the praises of him, who hath called you out of darkness into his mar-

vellous light : which in time past were not a people ; but are now the people of God ; which had not obtained mercy, but now have obtained mercy." These and a hundred other addresses to the Christian church are totally inapplicable to any pedo-baptist church, composed of a great many members incapable of distinguishing their right hand from the left. When the question is proposed, what has rendered pedo-baptist churches unworthy to be addressed in this way, the answer is—because they have received as members many, very many, that were merely children of the flesh, nay the nine tenths of all pedo-baptist churches became members by natural birth, and as the children of the flesh were constituted members. Infant sprinkling has then carnalized and secularized the church, and hence all pedo-baptist sects have become national churches, when they had it in their power ; for their views of the church are *carnalized*, as well as the members ; hence, papacy is the established religion of Italy, Spain, France, &c. Episcopacy, of England and Ireland, and Presbyterianism of Scotland. In the United States, the principles of civil policy being better understood, than in any other country in the world, not any form of religion has obtained the exclusive patronage of the State ; and may it continue so, till all sects shall be abolished, and all the children of God, united in faith, and hope, and love, shall know no bond of union but Christ; when party names, party love and party zeal, shall all be buried in one common grave, to rise no more forever.

The second evil I have specified, being sufficiently stated and established, I proceed to mention a third evil resulting from, and inseparably connected with infant sprinkling—viz.

3. Infant sprinkling imposes a religion upon the subjects of it, before they are aware of it, and thus deprives them of exercising the liberty of conscience in choosing that which they have examined, and in refusing that which they disapprove. It is despotism of the worst kind, to impose upon the conscience. It is the most despotic act, in the life of the greatest despot, to impose a religion upon his new born infant before it is aware ; and, as soon as it can reason, to tell it, that it vowed so and so in baptism, and that it would be a sin, of the deepest dye, if it should not, as soon as possible, attend to the things that it vowed. This is to fetter the exercise of reason, to rivet on the conscience a super-

stitution of the worst kind, and as far as the parent can, forever deprive it of any thing worthy to be called liberty of conscience. Hence it is, that all pedo-baptist sects increase more by natural generation, than by any other means. Very few are added to Romanists, Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Seceders, &c. in any other way than by ordinary generation.

There is nothing more congenial to civil liberty, than to enjoy an unrestrained, an unembargoed liberty of exercising the conscience freely upon all subjects respecting religion. Hence it is, that the Baptist denomination, in all ages, and in all countries, has been, as a body, the constant asserters of the rights of man, and of liberty of conscience; they have often been persecuted by pedo-baptists, but they never persecuted, though they have had it in their power.

If the conscience becomes once enslaved by any undue or early imposition upon it; it is impossible, or next to impossible, ever to assume or enjoy any thing like that noble independence of mind, which our Saviour taught in these words, "call no man master or father upon earth, for one is your father in heaven, and ye are brethren." This was in a conscientious point of view. The dearest liberty on earth is liberty of conscience, and this lost, all other liberty is but a name, a charm that lulls to sleep. It is an awful encroachment, to encroach upon the liberty of conscience. and how awful to encroach upon, nay, to deprive an infant of this liberty, before it can appreciate the greatness of the blessing, or calculate the magnitude of the loss. O ye pedo-baptists, if ye would but reflect on the cruelty of the practice, and observe what an engine of despotism it is in the hands of some of those sects you despise, how would you blush, and forever abandon the tradition! Can you suppose it is the spirit of God, that adds one million annually to the Church of Rome? Or can you suppose that it is the spirit of God that adds an hundred thousand annually to the church of England? Or can you believe that it is the same spirit, that adds a hundred thousand to the different grades of Presbyterians, in the same space of time? Seeing they are all added by natural generation and infant sprinkling!! No; if you think as rational beings, you cannot think so. It is this rite, and the vows they are taught to consider themselves under thereby, that is the powerful cause of such extensive additions. Infant sprinkling is

then an enthralling, despotic and cruel rite, destructive of liberty of conscience, and injurious to civil liberty.— This will be further manifest from the following item.

4. Infant sprinkling has uniformly inspired a persecuting spirit. This is a heavy charge, and requires to be well supported. I do not, however, mean to say, that every pedo-baptist has a persecuting spirit, or that every such church is, necessarily, a persecuting church. No; for I know many honorable exceptions, but I mean to say, that infant sprinkling has, as a system, inspired all the parties that embraced it with a persecuting spirit at one time or other, and they have manifested it, as far as the civil authority supported them. Nor do I mean to go back to tell of the persecutions of the church of Rome in old times, which every body knows—nor of the persecutions of countries far remote, but I will support the fact with documents more striking, because more modern, and because more within our country. I shall begin with my own state; the good old state of Virginia.

Anno Domini 1659, 1662 and 1663, several acts of the Assembly of this state made it penal in parents to refuse to have their children baptized, and prohibited the Quakers from assembling, and made it penal for any master of a ship to bring a quaker into the state. By the laws passed about this time, every person was compelled to go to church every Sunday, under the penalty of 50 lbs. of tobacco. But Quakers and non-conformists were liable to the penalties of the statute of 23d Elizabeth, which was 20l. sterling for every months' absence, and, moreover, for 12 months absence, to give security for their good behavior. Quakers were farther liable to a fine of two hundred pounds of tobacco, for each one found at one of their meetings, and in case of the insolvency of any one of them, those who were able were to pay for the insolvents.* The persecution of the Baptists in Virginia, did not extend so far as in some other states, at least I can find no documents to authorize me to say, that it extended further than fines, imprisonments, and the unguarded use of the tongue. James Ireland, a baptist, was imprisoned in Culpepper jail and treated very ill in other respects, for his tenets. A Mr. Thomas also, an active and useful minister, was much persecuted. The object of

* See Henning's Statutes at large, Vol. 1 and 2, for the above laws as quoted by Mr. Semple.

the above laws and persecution was to protect the Episcopal church, the salary of whose minister was first settled at 16,000 pounds of tobacco, in the year 1696, to be levied by the vestry on the titheables of the parish, and so continued to the Revolution.

So late as the year 1768 John Waller, Lewis Uraig, James Childs and others, were seized by the sheriff, and hauled before three magistrates, who stood in the meeting-house yard, and who bound them in the penalty of one thousand pounds, to appear at Court, two days after. At court they were arraigned as disturbers of the peace. On their trial they were vehemently accused by a lawyer who said to the court, "may it please your worships, these men are great disturbers of the peace, they cannot meet a man on the road, but they *must ram a text of Scripture down his throat.*" As they were moving through the streets of Fredericksburgh, they sung the hymn, "Broad is the road that leads to death," and Waller and the others continued in jail 43 days and were discharged without any conditions. While in prison they continually preached through the grates, and although the mob prevented the people from hearing, as much as possible, yet many heard to their permanent advantage. After their discharge they preached as before. Sometimes their enemies rode into the water to mock them baptizing, and often mocked them when preaching, by playing cards and drinking spirits while they were preaching. Two noted sons of Belial, who were notorious for these practices, named Kemp and Davis, both died soon after, ravingly distracted, each accusing the other of having led him into these crimes."

"In Goochland county this persecution raged vehemently. On the tenth of August, 1771, while a Mr. Webber was preaching from these words, 'shew me thy faith without thy works, and I will shew thee my faith by my works,' a magistrate pushed up, and drew back his club to knock him down. Some person caught the club, and prevented mischief. Being backed by two sheriffs, he seized Messrs. Webber, Waller, Greenwood and Ware—they were committed to prison—they were retained 30 days in close confinement, and fed on bread and water. As they preached through the grates, and made many converts, they were glad to let them go, on their giving of bond for good behaviour. A thousand false reports from the pulpit and from the press, misrepresent-

ing the doctrines and practice of these holy men, were amongst the means employed to keep up this fiery trial. But the revolution took the power out of the hands of their persecutors, and their cause triumphed. This is a small specimen of the Pedit-baptist persecutions of the baptists in Virginia, which will suffice my purpose in the mean time—(see Benedict's history of the Baptists, vol. 2, page 63-73.) I shall now quote a few facts from history in support of this item, to shew that not only the pedit-baptists of the Episcopacy, but those of other protestant sects, manifested the same spirit. In the good state of Massachusetts, (which I select not as the only state in which persecution raged, but as eminent for the exercise of this zeal) the baptists suffered much for many years. In this state, in the year 1644, we are informed by Mr. Hubbard, that a poor man, by the name of Painter, suddenly became baptist, and having a child born, would not suffer his wife to carry it to be baptized. He was complained of to the court, and was *enjoined* by it to suffer his child to be baptized. He had the impudence to tell them that infant baptism was an *anti-christian ordinance*, for which *he was tied up and whipped.*"

About this time a law was passed for the suppression of the baptists. After a long preamble, in which the baptists were accused of two great crimes; the one, for denying that the civil magistrate could lawfully inspect or punish men for any breach of the laws, in the first table of the law; the other, for saying that infants should not be baptized; it concludes with these words—"It is ordered and agreed, that if any person or persons within this jurisdiction, shall either openly condemn or oppose the *baptizing of infants*, or go about secretly to seduce others from the approbation or use thereof, or shall purposely depart the congregation at the ministration of the ordinance, or shall deny the ordinance of the magistracy, or their lawful right to make war, or to punish the outward breaches of the first table, and shall appear to the court wilfully and obstinately to continue therein, after due time and means of conviction, every such person or persons shall be *sentenced to banishment*. Of this act Mr. Hubbard, their own historian, says—"but with what success it is hard to say: all men being naturally inclined to pity them that suffer, and the clergy, doubtless, had a hand in framing this shameful act, as they, at this time, were the secretaries and counsellors of the legislature."

"About this time the Westminster Divines sat in London; a book written by one of the Baptist ministers was dedicated to the Westminster Divines. Soon after the news reached England, of the law to banish the Baptists, Mr. Tombes sent a copy of this work to the ministers of New England, and with it an epistle dated from the Temple in London, May 25, 1645, "hoping thereby to put them upon a more exact study of that controversy, and to allay their vehemency against the baptists."—"But the Westminster Assembly, says Backus, were more ready to learn severity from this country, than these were to learn lenity from any."

"All letters and remonstrances proved ineffectual with the New England Divines. They held fast their integrity—and in 1651 the baptists were unmercifully whipped, and not long after, the Quakers were murderously hung."

I am sorry that my prescribed limits forbid my giving any thing like a history of those times, or even from detailing the trials and able remonstrances of the baptists and Quakers in those days. I can only cull a few facts, out of volumes of matter, to support this particular. The reader, anxious to read the history of these proceedings, I would refer to Benedict's History of the Baptists of New England, vol. 1, from pag 354 and onwards.

Obadiah Holmes was sentenced to pay 50*l.* or to be well whipped, for denying the lawfulness of infant baptism, and for baptizing some who had been sprinkled. In a manuscript of Governor J. Jenks, he says, "Mr. Holmes was whipped 30 stripes in such an unmerciful manner, that for many days he could take no rest, but as he lay upon his knees and elbows, not being able to suffer any part of his body to touch the bed on which he lay.

"Warrants were issued against 13 persons for pitying Mr. Holmes—two of them only could be taken—they were sentenced to pay 40 shillings, or to receive ten lashes."

When I shall have transcribed another act of the Assembly, I shall bring this article to a close. In May, 1668, the Assembly decreed, "That, whereas, Thomas Gould, Wm. Turner, and John Turner, sen. obstinate and turbulent Anabaptists, have some time since combi-

ned themselves with others in a pretended church state, without the knowledge and approbation of the authority here established; to the great grief and offence of the Godly orthodox; the said persons did, in open court, assert their former practice to have been according to the mind of God, that *nothing they had heard convinced them to the contrary*, which practice, being also otherwise circumstanced with making infant baptism a nullity, and thereby making *us all* to be unbaptized persons, and so, consequently, no regular churches, ministry, or ordinances; as also renouncing *all our churches*, as being *so bad and corrupt*, as they are not to hold communion with. This court do judge it necessary, that they be removed to some other part of this country, or elsewhere, and accordingly doth *order*, that the said Thomas Gould, Wm. Turner, and John Farnar, sen. do, before the 20th July next, remove themselves out of this jurisdiction; and that if, after the said 20th of July, either of them be found, in any part of this jurisdiction, without license had from the court or council, he or they shall be forthwith apprehended and committed to prison, by warrant from any magistrate, and there remain without bail or mainprize, until he or they shall give sufficient security to the governor, or any magistrate, immediately to depart the jurisdiction, and not to return as abovesaid.—And whereas, Thomas Gould is now committed to prison, in the county of Middlesex, by the last court of assistants, for non-payment of a fine imposed, this court judgeth it meet, after the sentence of this court is published this day, after *the lecture to them*, that the said Gould shall be discharged from imprisonment in Middlesex as to his fine; that so he may have time to prepare to submit to the judgment of the court.”—Acts of the Assembly, 1668.

Under this act and the preceding, many suffered for conscience sake, from the hands of the orthodox. Time would fail me, to tell of the persecutions of the poor baptists, under the dominion of “the orthodox” in other parts of this country, and in Europe, in ancient and modern times.—Some of the strongest arguments of the pedit-baptists, in support of the rite of infant sprinkling, have been fines, imprisonments, banishment, stripes, &c. They have made it a bloody rite!! Like circumcision indeed!

In support of my assertion, that infant baptism inspires a persecuting spirit, I conceive sufficient documents have been adduced—but I have only adduced a few of the most

recent and the most mild, and also in relation to one of the many objects of persecution. All the persecutions that have ever been carried on in Christendom, have been carried on by pedo-baptists. Baptists and quakers, every body knows, never persecuted; they have, however, had the good fortune to be often persecuted. But who was it that burned John Huss and Jerome of Prague? Pedo-baptists. Who was it, dug up the bones of Wicklif and burned them? Pedo-baptists. Who was it that burned, beheaded, hung, drowned, and massacred, in a hundred forms, millions of the best men in Europe—in Germany, France, Spain, England, Ireland, Wales, &c.? Pedo-baptists. I am sorry that so many evidences exist on the page of history, in support of the truth of my observation—Alas! it is too true. Civil law, and a new order of things, have, however, checked the prevalence of this spirit in this country, and also in the greater part of Europe. I believe no pedo-baptist sect of equal power, and equal age, persecuted less than the English Episcopalians, but even they cannot wash their hands of cruelty towards the baptists and others.

It is no pleasing theme for me to enlarge on these things. I wish to insist no farther, than will merely suffice to establish the point under consideration. I would much rather draw the vail of forgetfulness over these things, if my duty, on the present topic, did not require it.

I must however, obviate one objection that may, perhaps, be made against the use I make of the above historic evidence, viz. 'that this persecuting spirit is not a necessary appendage to infant sprinkling.' I do not say that every pedo-baptist did, or does, possess such a spirit; and no doubt the increase of religious and political knowledge, has tended much to suppress such a spirit—yet, I could wish that we had not evidence, so convincing, that the same spirit yet exists; and in many instances vents itself, even at the very threshold of the city of refuge, which our constitution and laws have established, for the common benefit of men of all religious persuasions. The spirit of persecution, I am convincell, necessarily grows out of the system, inas-much as it necessarily confounds the radical distinction betwixt the church and the world, by making baptism a birth-right privilege, and thereby bringing the world into the church. The world, I say, in as far as the professors are pedo-baptists, which was once almost universally the case, throughout all the nations professing Christianity.—The obvious and necessary consequence of which was, the

putting of the administration and management of the whole concerns and interests of religion, for the most part, into the hands of ungodly men; as the history of nearly 1500 years past awfully testifies, and we are assured by the highest authority, that such will ever hate and persecute. John 15th, 18, 19, 20, compared with Titus 3d, 3d. Moreover, by thus confounding the world and the church, the whole rising generation being included as members without their own knowledge or consent, became necessarily, that is constitutionally, subject to the censures of the church, that is the professing part, for every deviation from the established order of things, either in opinion or practice.— Now to inflict censures on persons for non-conformity, in any respect, to a religion which they never chose nor avowed, is as certainly ecclesiastical persecution, as it is absurd in the nature of things so to do. Nor till of late years did the evil cease with this, for as it is the native tendency of pedo-baptism to secularize Christianity, by uniting church and state, the persons who disobeyed the former became necessarily responsible to the latter, as was lately the case throughout all European nations. Thus in all cases of obstinacy, where ecclesiastical persecution ended, civil persecution began, and the excommunicated became the subject of civil penalties; and all this, in the case before us, on account of dissent or non-conformity to the laws or doctrines of a religion, which the persecuted never chose, nor professed; and which, if it were the true religion, he was utterly incapable of making a free profession at the time of his baptism. “For the natural man receiveth not the things of the spirit of God, neither can he know them, for they are spiritually discerned.”

But since, in consequence of the pleadings of the celebrated Milton, Locke, and others, the nations, guided by a more enlightened policy, have forsaken the decisions of Trent and the Solemn League. The civil sword has ceased to operate upon the sceptic and unregenerate, in order to constrain them to profess and practice what they neither understood, believed, nor loved: and in so doing, it has done them no wrong, nor the church any injury. In like manner, the conscientious Christian, who could not say *shibboleth*, has escaped the direful alternative; either recant or die. But, although civil persecution has thus, for the most part, ceased its operation; and ecclesiastical, it is hoped is upon the whole becoming less virulent; yet so long as pedo-baptism is considered a privilege of such vast im-

portance, as the respective creeds of pedo-baptist professors declare it to be, it is impossible to suppose, that the spirit of bitterness and persecution shall cease to operate—can a person who thinks, that his children are by natural generation, as being his offspring, entitled to Church membership and of course baptism; yea, and that by receiving this ordinance, “they become children of God, heirs of Christ, and inheritors of the kingdom of glory,” or that, “it signifies and seals to them, their engrafting into Christ and secures to them a participation of all the blessings of the covenant of grace”—I say, can a person of these sentiments, cease from considering with anger and aversion the man, who deprives his own children of such inestimable benefits, and would rob his, in like manner, if he could but prevail upon him to embrace his opinions in relation to this subject? For how prone mankind are to appreciate birth-right privilege, national family, and religious lot, the history of the Jews attests. With what virulence did they oppose and persecute Christ and his apostles for attempting to cut off, from them, the fancied entail of the divine favor on account of their carnal descent from Abraham.

As an instance of this, if I might—“*sic parvis componere magna*,” I would observe that at the close of our debate at Mount Pleasant, some of the pedo-baptists (as I afterwards understood from some of the most creditable witnesses) proposed, violently forcing us to quit the ground, by *argumentum baculinum*, as their logic appeared too weak. This I presume is a case in point, the reader need not doubt of its authenticity.

To be angry at any man, because of his opinions in religion, is the essence of persecution. They who think a man may become religious, of his own accord, or make his children Christians by his own efforts, may very naturally get angry with him that does not do what is so easy to be done. But a scriptural baptist cannot be angry with any man because of his religious opinions, or because he is not a Christian or a member of his church; for he knows and confesses, that “except the Lord build the Church, it cannot be built;” that, “except a man be born of water and of the spirit, he cannot enter into the Church of Christ.” And as no man can become such by natural birth, by his own efforts, or the efforts of others, he cannot be angry, and consequently cannot persecute his neighbors for not thinking or acting in all respects as himself. Hence, the very spirit of the baptist profession is inimical to a spirit of persecution; no wonder then, that

they have never persecuted. An enlightened Christian may deplore and commiserate the errors of others, in opinion, but cannot be angry at his neighbour, because he does not coincide with him, seeing it is the gift of God. He knows who hath made him to differ, and like one of old, he thinks, when he hears an errorist propagate his opinions, "such would I have been, had it not been for the grace of God."—For my own part, I conceive it to be as reasonable to blame a man, for being black, or for not being seven feet high, as to blame him for not being a Christian. It is no way strange, that those who embrace the whole system of John Calvin should persecute even unto death, as he himself set them so striking an example, in persecuting Servetus even unto death.

5. The fifth evil, that I shall mention, resulting from the practice of infant sprinkling is, that it inspires the subject as soon as he recognizes the action, and understands it as his parents explain it, with a vain conceit that he is something better than a heathen, or now in a state differing from that of an unbaptized person; with respect to the enjoyment of interest in Christ—this is peculiarly dangerous to the subject himself, as its tendency is in the highest degree Pharisaic. The sacred scriptures know but two states or conditions of men on earth: these are, the state of nature and the state of grace—the whole promises, admonitions, threats, and addresses, of every kind, contained in the Bible, are predicated upon this fact—all men are first in the state of nature, and no external rite can remove them from it.—Nothing but actual grace in the heart, received through the operation of the spirit of God, by the word of faith. Deluded are they, in the highest degree, who repose the least confidence in this old tradition. But it is fashionable; and it is with some accounted a disgrace, to give their children their names, as we name the beasts that perish—and if it be honorable to practice it, this is all in all with many—"woe is unto them that seek the honor that cometh from man, and not that which cometh from God only."

I have thus given a specimen of the *evils* resulting from infant sprinkling and infant baptism—the reader may add to them from his own observation some others, that I have not time to publish at present. I have succeeded much better, in finding the evils of this rite, than in pointing out the *good* resulting from it. For the fact is, I can find no good connected with it. But, least the reader should think that

I am too illiberal, I will transcribe a few sentences from the most famous writer that ever wrote in support of infant baptism. I mean Dr. Wall, who published an elaborate history of infant baptism, in the year 1705. This Dr. Wall is often quoted by the pedit-baptists; but they do not often tell us, that while he contended for infant baptism, he ridiculed the idea of infant sprinkling—he is the only writer on the subject, that I know, with whom I can agree, in respect of some of the benefits resulting from infant baptism, in his time; his words are: “There has no novelty or alteration, that I know of, in the point of baptism, been bro’t into the church, but in the way and manner of administering it. The way that is now ordinarily used, we cannot deny to have been a novelty, brought into the church (of England) by those that learned it in Germany, or at Geneva. And they were not contented with following the example of pouring a quantity of water, which had there been introduced instead of immersion, but improved it (if I may so abuse that word) from pouring to sprinkling, that it might have as little resemblance of the ancient way of baptizing, as possible.”—“Another struggle,” says he, “whether the child shall be dipped or sprinkled, will be with the midwives and nurses. These will use all the interest they have with the mothers, which is very great, to dissuade them from agreeing to the dipping of the child. I know of no reason, unless it be this, a thing which they value themselves and their skill much upon, is, the neat dressing of the child on the christening day, the setting all the trimming, the pins, and the laces, in their proper order. And if the child be brought in loose clothes, which may be presently taken off, for the baptism, and put on again, this pride is lost. And this makes a reason. So little is the solemnity of the sacrament regarded by many, who mind nothing *but the dress and the eating and drinking.*”^a To understand what the Doctor means by the eating and drinking, it is necessary to observe, that, in those days, there was usually a feast made at the baptism of the child, which, with some christening fees, rendered it very interesting to some good people. The following is an illustration of the eating and drinking alluded to by the Doctor:

“The bill of fare of a dinner at Tynningham, the house of the Rt. Hon. the earl of Haddington, on Thursday, the 21st of Aug. 1679, when his lordship’s son was baptized:

^a Dr. Wall’s Defence, p. 146, 147, 403.

Fresh beef,	pieces	6	Chickens roasted,	9
Mutton,	do.	16	Do. Stewed,	30
Veal,	do.	4	Do. Frickaseed,	12
Legs of Venison,		3	Do. In Pottage,	8
Geese,		6	Lamb,	10
Pigs,		4	Wild fowl,	22
Old Turkeys,		2	Pigeons baked, roasted, and	
Young do.		8	stewed,	182
Salmon,		4	Hares roasted,	10
Tongues and Udders,		12	Do. Frickaseed,	6
Ducks,		14	Hams,	3
Roasted Fowls,		6	A Puncheon of Claret, &c.	

Who will not say that there was much good in all this?

No. 4.

THE QUARTERLY THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

THIS new work is published by Ezra Stiles Ely, D. D. of Philadelphia. It reviews religious publications of the present day. In vol. 1, No. 3, the author reviews sundry pedo-baptist performances, on the "subject and mode" of Baptism. He exhibits their respective and comparative merits, with great spirit. This number came into my hands a few days since, I have been amused with it, and with the management of the Doctor. It exemplifies the principle of the rule in Arithmetic, called permutation, and admirably exhibits how many changes can be rung on a few bells.—The writers on the Doctor's side of the question, follow one another in a dull round of uniformity, as to argument; but with great variety as to style and method. They all begin to establish their point 2000 years before Christian baptism was instituted, and wander down along the dusty road, with great hazard and much perplexity; often parched with drought and bewildered in labyrinths and deep mazes, with which the route abounds. In glancing over this third number, I observe that all the leading arguments in it are reviewed, and fully refuted in the preceding pages. The Doctor has done himself great honor, and the cause great service, and is entitled to the thanks of his pedo-baptist brethren, for his having given them, what they so long needed, viz. a new definition of baptism. This definition is suited to the highly improved knowledge and taste of the 19th century. It no doubt comports with the views of the Doctor, and many of his brethren, and if it was not for one misfortune, it would be very popular. I shall transcribe it.

"Baptism, under the Christian Dispensation, we define
 "to be, a solemn application of water to a professor of the
 "Christian religion, or to a member of his or her family,
 "by a minister of the gospel, (and by the authority of
 "Christ's command given after his resurrection) in the
 "name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost."

This definition of Baptism, like the lean kind in Pharaoh's vision, devours all the "good definitions" given by the pedo-baptists whom he reviews; and even yet it is not *canonical*. If it was not for this misfortune, he would enable us to prove that "*any mode*" of baptism would do, provided only that it were *solemn*—"It is a *solemn* application of water," says he. The charity of the Doctor's definition, resembles the charity of the poet—

"For modes of faith, let zealous bigots fight,
 "His can't be wrong, whose life is in the right."

A "*solemn application of water*," by sprinkling, pouring or dipping, will do, will please the Doctor very well. How easy to prove infant baptism, or sprinkling from it! "To a member of a professor's family," the doctor says. I do not know why the Doctor's charity should be so lame in respect of the subject, when it was so illustrious in the "*mode*." Why the member of a professor's family? Why not the member of a non-professor's family?—There is a common case in Virginia, in relation to which, I fear the Doctor's definition is not sufficiently explicit; it is this—sometimes a professor's family is composed of eight or ten children, and three or four families of servants, all of which compose the professor's family or household. Amongst the servants, some are professors and some are not; are all to be baptised on account of the professor's profession whose the family is? And are the children of the professing servant to be sprinkled on their father's or their master's profession? In making this obvious, I fear the Doctor's definition is deficient. But, perhaps, as it was penned in Pennsylvania, it was not intended for Virginia pedo-baptists.

Until the Doctor makes his meaning more plain, and more fully settles this and some other circumstances, I conceive it is most prudent still to retain the old fashioned definitions of the fishermen of Gallilee.

As the Doctor is in the habit of reviewing, and as he insists that the Christian church is a continuation of the Jewish, and essentially the same as the Jewish, he would confer a favor on many, who think otherwise, if he would review and illustrate the following queries:

1. Are not a constitution, laws, ordinances, subjects, and privileges, the chief constituents of a church state?

2. Was the constitution that erected the Jewish nation into a national church, the same as the New Testament, or constitution of the Christian church?

3. Were the laws that regulated the worship, discipline, political economy, judicial proceedings, and common intercourse of the Jews, the same, as those under which the disciples of Christ act?

4. Were the ordinances of the Jewish state, the same, with regard to their import, times of observance, number, the character and quality of the observers or participants of them?

5. Are the subjects of the Christian church to be such in birth, education, temper and character, as the subjects of the commonwealth of Israel?

6. Are the privileges enjoyed by Christians in the church of Christ just the same as those enjoyed by the Jews?

7. When he has answered the first question in the affirmative, and the next five in the negative, (which, if he consults the holy oracles, he must) then how are two things *the same*, which *differ* in every essential particular?

When the Doctor shall have answered and illustrated the above seven queries, I would solicit him to consider the following characters of the Jewish and Christian church, as respects the controversy.

The Jewish church embraced a whole nation, and was a national church. It was composed of one man's posterity together with his *bought servants* and their offspring, and these by *natural birth*, and a *ceremonial holiness*, were *fit* and *lawful* subjects of *all* its ordinances, *without any grace*. It increased by *natural generation* only, and from it, there was *no excommunication* but by death, for *any crime* whatever. The religion of it was incorporated with the civil government, and consequently, civil, religious and political powers, were lodged in the same hands.

The Christian church never embraced any whole nation, and is not a national church. It is not composed of one man's family, nor of all of such families, a portion of which it embraces. All the members of it are intelligent, voluntary subjects. Nothing but *real* and *personal holiness* qualifies for its ordinances. Its subjects increase by *supernatural birth*, or are the subjects of the regenerating influences of the all creative spirit. It is *not of this world*, and the ministers of it, as such, cannot exercise any civil authority. Its members may be excommunicated for unbecoming con-

duct, and again received when their penitence and reformation become manifest.

When the Doctor shall have proved the identity of these two states, when he shall have shown that things which differ, in every grand circumstance and quality, are one and the same, then shall he have excelled all that have gone before him, then shall he have exhibited a new thing under the sun.

No. 5.

RICHARD BAXTER.

THE author of the "Saint's Everlasting Rest," and of a *Serious Call to the Unconverted*, has been by many esteemed one of the greatest saints of modern times. Piety and benevolence, it is said, were in him eminently conspicuous. We would be led to suppose, from some of his works and from the commendations of many, that if there ever was a pederbaptist that was all love and tenderness, in whose bosom the system of pederbaptism never produced a persecuting emotion, Richard Baxter was that man.—As an illustration of one of the evil tendencies of that system, I will let you hear the learned and pious, humble and affectionate Mr. Baxter, speak for himself. "My 6th argument," said he, "shall be against the usual manner of their baptizing, as it is by dipping over head in a river, or other cold water. That which is a plain breach of the 6th commandment "*thou shalt not kill*," is no ordinance of God, but a heinous sin.—And as Mr. Cradock shows, in his book of Gospel Liberty, the magistrate ought to *restrain* it, to save the lives of his subjects.—That this is *flat murder*, and no better, being ordinarily and generally used, is undeniable to any understanding man. And I know not what trick, a covetous landlord can find out to get his tenants to die apace, that he may have new fines and heriots, likelier than to encourage such preachers, that he may get them all to turn Anabaptist. I wish that this device be not it which countenanceth such men; and covetous physicians, methinks, should not be much against them, catarrhs and obstructions, which are the two great fountains of most mortal diseases in man's body, could scarce have a more notable means to produce them, where they are not, or to increase them where they are. Apoplexies, lethargies, palsies, and all other comatous diseases, would be promoted by it. So would cephalalgies, hemicranies, pthysies, debility of the stomach, crud-

ties, and almost all fevers, dysenteries, diarrhœas, cholies, iliac passions, convulsions, spasms, and so on. All hepatic, splenetic and pulmonic persons, and hypochondriacs, would soon have enough of it. In a word, it is good for nothing but to dispatch men out of the world, that are burdensome, and to ranken church yards. I conclude, if murder be a sin, then dipping, ordinarily overhead in England is a sin; and if those who would make it men's religion to murder themselves, and urge it upon their consciences as a duty, are not to be suffered in a commonwealth, any more than highway murderers; then judge how these Anabaptists, that teach the necessity of such dipping, are to be suffered."* To this the celebrated Mr. Booth replies in the following words: "Poor man, he seems to be afflicted with a violent hydrophobia! For he cannot think of any person being immersed in cold water, but he starts, he is convulsed, he is ready to die with fear. Immersion, you must know, is like Pandora's box; and pregnant with a great part of those diseases, which Milton's angel presented to the view of our first father. A compassionate regard, therefore, to the lives of his fellow creatures, compels Mr. Baxter to solicit the aid of magistrates against this destructive plunging; and to cry out, in the spirit of an exclamation once heard in the Jewish temple—" *Ye men of Israel help!*" or Baptist ministers will depopulate your country! Know you not, that these plunging teachers are shrewdly suspected of being pensioned by avaricious landlords, to destroy the lives of your liege subjects? Exert your power! Apprehend the delinquents! Appoint an *auto da fe*! Let the venal dippers be baptized in blood; and thus put a salutary stop to this pestiferous practice! What a pity it is, that the celebrated history of cold bathing, by Sir John Floyer, was not published half a century sooner! It might, perhaps, have preserved this good man from a multitude of painful paroxysms, occasioned by the thought of immersion in cold water. Were I seriously (adds Mr. Booth) to put a query to these assertions of Mr. Baxter, it would be, with a little variation, in the words of David, "*What shall be given unto thee, or what shall be done unto thee thou FALSE pen?*"

About this time the famous John Bunyan, a baptist that will be held in everlasting remembrance, was confined to prison 12 years. He experienced some of the peaceful and benevolent effects of the spirit that Mr. Baxter breathed in the preceding extracts.

* Baxter's Plain Scripture Proof, p. 134—136.

No. 6.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

THE design of the following questions and answers, is to assist those who are desirous of ascertaining the mind and will of God, concerning this important institution of Christ, on which we have been reasoning. We propose them in such a way, as to lead the reader immediately to the holy oracles for his own satisfaction. The answers which we affix to them, are the only answers that can be given them, from the infallible word. But as we are all fallible and imperfect, I would earnestly solicit the reader never to place implicit confidence in any mortal, nor in himself, but diligently to consult the divine word, and to solicit the Father of Lights for that wisdom which cometh from above.

We are firmly persuaded that no other answers can be given, from the scriptures, to the following queries, but such as are here written.

Query 1st. Who was the first Baptist?—*Ans.* John, the forerunner of Christ, called "*John the Baptist.*"

Question 2. Was the baptism of John from Heaven, or of men?—*Answer.* From Heaven.

Q. 3. How did John receive it?—*A.* From the spirit of God, by immediate revelation.

Q. 4. Did John teach the people, that the baptism he taught was derived from any Jewish rite, or from any ancient covenant?—*Ans.* No—"He was sent to baptize." John 1, 33.

Q. 5. From whom did the *Apostle* receive authority to baptize?—*A.* From Christ—Matt. 28—at the close.

Q. 6. Did they ever teach, that they had learned it from any Jewish rite or covenant?—*A.* No.

Q. 7. Whom did they baptize?—*A.* Men and women only.

Q. 8. What was the indispensable qualification necessary to their baptism?—*A.* Faith, "If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest." Acts 8—37.

Q. 9. Did you ever read of the baptism of any infants in the scriptures?—*A.* No.

Q. 10. Did you ever read of the sprinkling of any infants in the scriptures?—*A.* No.

Q. 11. Whose commandment, then, do we obey, in having our infants baptized or sprinkled?—*A.* The commandment of the clergy.

Q. 12. Do we transgress any divine command in neglecting to have our infants baptized?—*A.* No—I never read of

any one being accused of this sin in the Bible: nor of any commandment which was thereby transgressed.

Q. 13. Did you ever read of any *sponsors* in the Bible?—*A.* No.

Q. 14. What do you mean by a *sponsor*?—*A.* I mean, one that promises and engages for another in baptism.

Q. 15. Did you ever read in the scriptures of any one promising any thing for another in baptism?—*A.* No—no promises of parent nor of child, at baptism, is ever mentioned in the Bible.

Q. 16. Whence originated the custom of promising and vowing in baptism?—*A.* From the Clergy.

Q. 17. Did you ever read in the scriptures of any vows that minors or adults were under, in consequence of baptism?—*A.* None.

Q. 18. What are the promises given to baptized infants or minors in the New Testament?—*A.* None.

Q. 19. What are the threats denounced against them, that neglect to have their infants baptized?—*A.* Many from the Clergy, but none from the Bible.

Q. 20. Is baptism a command?—*A.* Yes, “be baptized every one of you.”

Q. 21. Should not every divine command be obeyed?—*A.* Yes.

Q. 22. In what does religious obedience consist?—*A.* In a voluntary act of an intelligent agent.

Q. 23. Is a person active, or passive in obeying a command?—*A.* Active.

Q. 24. Is an infant active or passive, conscious or unconscious, in receiving baptism?—*A.* It is passive and unconscious.

Q. 25. Can a being that is passive and unconscious in suffering an action, be said to be obeying a command in that same action?—*A.* By no means.

Q. 26. Can those persons who have been baptized in infancy be said, on the foregoing principles, to have obeyed the divine command “be baptized.”—*A.*—No—impossible.

Q. 27. Is baptism an act of religious worship?—*A.* Yes—all divine ordinances are appointed for us to worship God thereby.

Q. 28. How must acceptable worship be performed?—*A.*—“In spirit and truth.” God is a spirit, and they that worship him, must be worshipped in spirit and truth.—John 4.

Q. 29. Can unthinking and unconscious infants worship God in spirit and in truth?—*A.* No.

Q. 30. Can they, then, in conformity to these principles, be baptized, as an act of religious worship?—*A.* No.

Q. 31. Is baptism appointed for the benefit of the subject?
A. Yes.

Q. 32. Are there any benefits resulting from baptism in this life?—*A.* Many.

Q. 33. What are the benefits resulting from baptism in this life?—*A.* They are briefly comprehended in one sentence, viz.—“*The answer of a good conscience toward God.*”—1 Pet. 3, 21.

Q. 34. In what does the answer of a good conscience consist?—*A.* In three things. First, the knowledge of the meaning of baptism. Second, a belief of the fact and import of the death and resurrection of Christ, to which baptism refers. Third, in the consciousness of our own minds, that we have voluntarily and intelligently obeyed the divine command. See Rom. 6-1-6, 1 Pet. 3, 20-22.

Q. 35. Can any infant be conscious of these things in baptism; or can it afterwards reflect that it intelligently, voluntarily, and cheerfully obeyed, the divine command?—*A.* It is utterly impossible.

Q. 36. Is there, then, no way in which an infant can obtain by reflection or otherwise the answer of a good conscience from baptism?—*A.* None.

Q. 37. Can an adult, when instructed in the import of baptism, receive any consolation from reflecting that his parents had him baptized when an infant? *A.* No, unless it be a delusive consolation, for the answer of a good conscience can only be enjoyed, through an inward consciousness that the subject has intelligently and voluntarily obeyed a divine commandment.

Q. 38. How does any adult know that he was baptized in infancy? *A.* By the report of others.

Q. 39. Is there any duty, inculcated in the New Testament, that requires us *only* to have the testimony of others for our having performed it?—*A.* Not one.

Q. 40. Is there any promise accompanying our obedience to the commands of God?—*A.* Yes. “In keeping of them there is a great reward.” Psalms 19, 11—Prov. 3, 16, 18, Prov. 11, 18, Prov. 29, 18, Heb. 11, 6, 26, James 1, 25.

Q. 41. Is there any reward accompanying infant baptism?—*A.* None—except “the praise of men.”

Q. 42. Is there any peculiar promise accompanying baptism?—*A.* Yes, “the promise of the divine spirit as a comforter.” Acts 2, 38, 39. Acts 19, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6.

Q. 43. Who were the first persons baptized after the dispensation of the spirit commenced?—*A.* The three thousand on the day of Pentecost. Act 2, 40, 44.

Q. 44. What was required of them in order to baptism?
A. Repentance, or faith in Christ, which is inseparable from true repentance. Act 2, 37.

Q. 45. What were the *immediate* duties of those baptized on that day?—*A.* Union with the Church, and obedience to all commandments and ordinances.

Q. 46. How soon were the baptized added to the Church?
A. “*That same day,*” “and they continued stedfastly in the Apostle’s doctrine, in breaking of bread, in fellowship, and in prayers.” Act 2, 41, 42.

Q. 47. Is this true of any infants after baptism? No, it never was, nor in the nature of things can it ever be.

Q. 48. What is the necessary qualification to all parts of Christian practice?—*A.* *Faith.*

Q. 49. Is there no Christian duty to be performed without faith in the subject?—*A.* None.

Q. 50. Why so?—*A.* Because, “*without faith it is impossible to please God.*” Heb. 11, 6.

Q. 51. Can it then be pleasing to God to baptize or sprinkle infants?—*A.* No—seeing without faith, it is impossible to please God.

Q. 52. Can the infant itself in receiving this rite please God?—*A.* No; for it is destitute of faith.

Q. 53. How do you know that infants are destitute of faith?—*A.* Because they cannot believe in him of whom they have never heard. As saith the Apostle, Rom. 10, 14, “*How shall they believe in him of whom they have never heard?*”

Q. 54. But may there not be two kinds of baptism, one suited to believers, and one to infants destitute of faith?—*A.* No, for the scriptures speak only of *one baptism.*

Q. 55. Why did John baptize at Enon?—*A.* “Because there was much water there.”

Q. 56. Would not a few quarts of water baptize hundreds?
A. No—a few quarts might sprinkle hundreds, but could not baptize one.

Q. 57. Why did John baptize in Jordan?—*A.* Because there was much water there.

Q. 58. Who appointed the sprinkling of infants?—*A.* the clergy.

Q. 59. When did sprinkling become general amongst Roman pedo-baptists?—*A.* The Pope in the year 1311 declared sprinkling or immersion was indifferent, either would do very well.—But in England it did not become general, till after the reign of Queen Elizabeth.

Q. 60. Why do they sprinkle the water upon the face?
A. Because, thus the clergy have ordained.

Q. 61. Why do they not sprinkle the foreskin seeing the Jews circumcised it? *A.* Because it would be indecent and impolite.

Q. 62. Was not, then, circumcision indecent and impolite?—*A.* No—for it was commanded of God.

Q. 63. Can you give no better reason for sprinkling the face than that given?—*A.* No: the clergy have pitched upon it, and perhaps they had some reason for it.

Q. 64. To what is baptism compared in the New Testament?—*A.* To “a burial and resurrection”—Rom. 6. 4, 6.

Q. 65. Does sprinkling the face resemble a burial? *A.* No.

Q. 66. Does immersing the whole person resemble a burial?—*A.* Yes—“We are *buried* with him by *baptism*.”

Q. 67. Does a child carrying away from the preacher resemble a resurrection?—*A.* No.

Q. 68. How then is a resurrection exhibited?—*A.* After the subject has been immersed in water, and completely overwhelmed in it; his rising up out of the water is an emblem of a resurrection.

Q. 69. Is baptism compared to any thing else in the scriptures?—*A.* Yes: to the regenerating influences and operation of the spirit of God: Hence we read of “*the washing of regeneration*” and of the “*baptism of the holy spirit*.”

Q. 70. Is sprinkling an emblem of the operation of the spirit?—*A.* No.

Q. 71. What is there in immersion in water that is an emblem of the regenerating operation of the spirit?—*A.* The application of water to the whole person of the subject and the consequent “*putting off of the filth of the flesh*” is an emblem of the operation of the spirit upon the *whole soul* of man, affecting the understanding, will, and affections, and the consequent “*putting off of the sins of the flesh*,” or the old man with his deeds. This, immersion beautifully exhibits, but sprinkling cannot.

Q. 72. How shall an illiterate man know the meaning of the Greek word baptism?—*A.* By enquiring how the Greek church practice this rite. It is certain they ought to understand their own language best.

Q. 73. And how do the Greek church administer this ordinance?—*A.* Even to this day they immerse every subject, in all climes, and in all cases in which they may be placed.

Q. 74. Has not immersion in cold water been a dangerous practice?—*A.* No: In the frozen regions of Russia and Canada, in the midst of the coldest winters; and in the warmest climates, in the torrid zone, it has been practiced without danger but with manifest safety to the administrators and the subjects.

Q. 75. Why was sprinkling substituted for immersion?
A. To gratify the caprice, the pride, and the carnality of the human mind.

Q. 76. Why were infants baptized or sprinkled, seeing there is no such command or precedent in the Bible?—**A.** Why did the Israelites make a golden calf—Uzzah touch the sacred ark—and Naidab and Abihu offer strange and uncommanded fire upon the altar of the Lord? From the same principle, and for the same reason, was this practice first introduced.

Q. 77. Did you ever read of infant church membership?
A. Yes, in books of baptism, but never in the Bible.

Q. 78. What do you understand by infant church membership?—**A.** I understand the phrase to mean, that infants are members of the visible church.

Q. 79. Are there any directions given in the scriptures for the proper discipline and management of infant members?—**A.** None: the Bible knows of no such members: it addresses all members as equally qualified by faith and grace to attend to all the ordinary duties of christianity.

Q. 80. Do we ever read of any members of the church, who are qualified for one or two of the ordinances of the church, and disqualified for attendance on the other institutions of it?—**A.** None.

Q. 81. Can infants, then, be considered as members of the visible church, seeing they are not qualified for the observance of the ordinances of it?—**A.** By no means.

Q. 82. Is Jesus Christ represented as king, of his kingdom or church?—**A.** Yes. Rev. 19, 16.

Q. 83. Wherein does the honor and glory of a king consist?—**A.** In reigning over a willing people; a people who love and esteem him, and serve him as volunteers; and in governing them in wisdom and justice.

Q. 84. Is Christ such a king?—**A.** Yes. Ps. 110, 1-2-3.

Q. 85. What is the character of his subjects?—**A.** They are said to be '*a willing people*'—'*of the truth*'—'*taught of God*'—'*born from above*,' and '*true and faithful*.'

Q. 86. Are infants of such a character?—**A.** No; consequently cannot be subjects of his visible kingdom.

Q. 87. In what point of view are we to consider infants?
A. As inheriting an evil nature, "conceived in sin"—"brought forth in iniquity"—"prone to evil"—guilty and subject to death, the wages of sin. See Ps. 58, 3-51-5—Job. 14, 4—John 3, 6—Ep. 2, 3.

Q. 88. Can any of them be saved who die before they are

capable subjects of instruction?—*A.* Yes; by the merits and atonement of Christ.

Q. 89. Can we say how many, or whether all those who die in infancy, are saved?—*A.* There is no revelation of the Divine will on this subject; they are in the hands of one who feels more tenderly for them than we can, and we should cheerfully resign them to him, as unto "*a faithful creator.*"

Q. 90. As our greatest concern is with them that live, how should we manage them during childhood, with regard to their spiritual concerns?—*A.* We should, "bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord"—that is, we should make them well acquainted with the scriptures of truth; make them commit to memory the most plain and striking parts of it, respecting their present state and condition, the character of God, and of his son Jesus Christ our Lord, and the Doctrine of Christ: above all we should exhibit a good example before them, both in word and deed, and in their presence, as Christian parents, pray for them—for their illumination, renovation, and salvation—without endeavoring to force a profession of religion upon them, or the views of any particular party or sect. In every part of our instructions, & in relation to their whole deportment, we should deeply impress their minds with the view of a future state of retribution, and their accountability to God for all things committed to them, and by them thought, said or done. But let us leave it to God to make Christians of them, for if we attempt it, we shall spoil it.

Q. 91. Should we ever urge them to profess christianity?—*A.* No. We should teach them what it is to be a Christian, and the awful consequences of rejecting the Gospel, and dying in infidelity, but leave it to their own conscience, when, and how, to profess Christianity.

Q. 92. Would the sprinkling of them in infancy, tend to accelerate their conversion—would it secure, that they ever would be Christians, or confer upon them any Christian benefit?—*A.* Not in the least.

Q. 93. Have not many good Christians had their infants sprinkled or baptized in infancy?—*A.* I make no doubt but there were, and there are still some good Christians in this practice.

Q. 94. But would you make this a reason, why you, who are convinced that the thing is a mere tradition of men, should practice it?—*A.* No; for then might you pray to the Virgin Mary, believe in purgatory, make the sign of the cross in baptizing, believe in the divine right of kings, swear to the "*solemn league,*" believe the doctrine of consubstan-

tiation and transubstantiation, go into a monastery, take the vow of celibacy, or have more wives than one. For some good men have done some of these things.

Q. 95. Is not the same action alike good or bad to all who practice it?—*A.* No—for there is a great moral difference betwixt a person performing an action, thinking it right, and one performing the same action, doubting of its propriety, or knowing it to be wrong. The former is a simple mistake, the latter a wilful transgression. James says “to him that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, *to him it is sin;*” and Paul, “he that doubteth is condemned if he eat,” or act. Even civil law discriminates between the different degrees of demerit in the same action, arising from the knowledge and determination of the agent. Hence we have different kinds of murder, and different punishments annexed to each, according to the circumstances of it.

Q. 96. Are there not two kinds of sins of ignorance?—*A.* Yes: there is an unavoidable ignorance, and a wilful ignorance. The former exists where the subject has no possible means of information, such as the Indian’s ignorance of the Savior; the latter exists where the subject might know, if he would avail himself of the means of knowledge, which he possesses, such as the pedo-baptist’s ignorance of the true subject and action of baptism. Whatever excuse can be plead for the former, there is no extenuation of the latter.

Q. 97. If infant baptism be so evil a thing as is often represented by the baptists; it appears strange that the Almighty should have tolerated its continuance so long and suffered it to extend so far with impunity: how do you account for this?—*A.* The Almighty has suffered many errors to exist for so long a time, yea for a much longer time. The whole system of Antichrist is now more than 1200 years old, and paganism is several thousand years old. The future state only will exhibit the causes of this.

Q. 98. Do the baptists believe that all *they* receive are born from above?—*A.* Yes: in the judgment of charity they consider them as *professing* what they possess: hence they are justifiable in baptizing them. But a pedo-baptist cannot say, that, in the judgment of charity, he thinks all those he baptizes or sprinkles are christians.

Q. 99. How do you view all pedo-baptists with regard to this ordinance of baptism, can you, according to the scriptures consider them baptized persons, or do you consider them as unbaptized?—*A.* There is but one baptism, and all who have not been immersed in the name of the Father, Son, and holy Spirit, after having professed the faith of the Gospel, have never been baptized, and are now in an unbaptized state.

Q. 100. Why are all good people so much divided in their views of the scripture, seeing they have but one Bible, and all read it in the same language?—A. Because they belong to different sects, and have different systems, and they rather make the Bible bow to their own system, received by tradition from their fathers, than make their system bow to the Bible; or in other words, each man, too generally, views the Bible through the medium of his system, and of course it will appear to him to favor it. Just as if A, B & C should each put on different colored glasses, A puts on green spectacles, B yellow, and C blue: each one of them looks through his own glasses at a piece of white paper, and each concludes that he is right, not remembering that he has his spectacles on. Thus, to A it appears green, to B yellow, and to C blue. They begin to argue on the subject, and it is impossible for any one of them to convince another that he is wrong, each one feels a conviction next to absolute certainty that his opinion is right. But D, who has no spectacles on, and who is standing looking on, during the contest, very well knows that they are all wrong, he sees the spectacles on each man's nose and easily accounts for the difference. Thus one professor reads the Bible with John Calvin on his nose, another with John Wesley on his nose, a third with John Gill on his, and a fourth with good old Thomas Boston or the good old lights of Scotland. Thrice happy is the man who lifts the Bible as if it had dropt from heaven into his hand alone, and whose eyes are anointed with the true eye-salve that he may see.

No. 7.

THREE ADDITIONAL ARGUMENTS.

1. THAT infant baptism did not originate until a very great defection took place in the Christian religion, appears further obvious from the fact, that schools were formed in churches as early as the close of the second century, for preparing minors for baptism. The members of these schools were called "*Catechumens*," and were the children of believers or of those who were friendly to Christianity. These catechumens were divided into four classes, according to their rank and attainments. The first class was instructed at home; the second was called "*Audientes*," because they were permitted to hear sermons; the third was called "*Genuflectentes*," because they were received by the imposition of hands kneeling; the fourth was called "*Competentes et electi*," denoting the immediate candidates for

baptism, at the next festival. Minors were admitted into this state by the imposition of hands, and the sign of the cross. After examination, they were exercised for twenty days together, and were obliged to fasting and confession. Some days before baptism they went veiled, and it was customary to touch their ears, saying, *Ephatha*, i. e. be opened; as also to anoint their eyes with clay. (See Buck's Theological Dictionary, on the article Catechumens.) They were called Catechumens, from their being taught in the way of questions and answers to prepare them for baptism.

The argument that I draw from the existence of the Catechumens, is this—That, as the Catechumens were the children of believers, and of those favorable to Christian principles, and the intention of their being so classed was to prepare them for baptism; it is abundantly evident that infant baptism was not practised from the beginning of Christianity; for, then, this preparative state, in order to baptism, would have been impossible and unmeaning. As a fact still further corroborative of this argument, I would observe, that as soon as infant baptism became general, the Catechumen state expired, as no longer of use. Those who wish to become more fully acquainted with these Catechumens, I would refer to Eusebius and Du Pin.

2. A second argument against the pedo-baptists may be strongly urged from 1 Cor. 15, 29; with regard to the import and mode of administering the ordinance. The words are, “else what shall they do which are *baptized* for the dead, if the dead rise not at all?” “Why are they then baptized for the dead?” This verse has often puzzled pedo-baptist commentators. It is, however, very plain, when we consider the Apostle's design, which, in the whole of this chapter, was to prove and illustrate the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead. The Apostle's argument stands thus—“How absurd must they appear who are baptized as an emblem of their resurrection from the dead, if there be no resurrection, seeing this ordinance is designed to set forth a resurrection, it must of course be an unmeaning sign, and those who submit to it must be sadly disappointed if the dead rise not.” But is there any thing like a resurrection in *infant sprinkling*?

3. A third argument against the pedo-pabtist system, may be derived from the fact, that “A LIMITED COMMISSION IMPLIES A PROHIBITION OF SUCH THINGS AS ARE NOT CONTAINED IN IT; AND POSITIVE LAWS IMPLY THEIR NEGATIVE.” The commission under which the Apostles acted was limited, as every Christian will confess,

The duties of those who act under it are pointed out, and indeed every creature must act under a limited commission, for the very term itself imports something committed from a superior, or from the supreme.

The items contained in any commission, are *all the things* which the commissioned are authorized to perform. If these were not the case, a formal commission is quite an unmeaning thing. Hence, the commission of a magistrate points out, and circumscribes the duties of his office; if this were not the case, he might attend to the duties of the Sheriff, the Alderman, or the Legislator. Now his commission prohibits him from practising as a Legislator, and authorises him to act as a Justice of the Peace. In like manner the commission to baptize believers or disciples, prohibits the baptism of others—yea, it *forbids* infant baptism as plainly as “thou shalt *not* steal,” implies thou must be honest, or as, “I have appointed the sons of Levi to minister in the service of the tabernacle” prohibits the sons of Benjamin or any other tribe, from ministering in those things. Unless Pedit-baptists can shew a new commission from Heaven, and confirm it by miracles, authorizing them to baptize infants, they should candidly give up their cause, for this last argument completely overthrows it; and if there was not a second argument in the world against their cause, in this respect, all their genius, learning and talents combined, are unable to remove it.

No. 8.

THE CONCLUSION OF THE WHOLE MATTER.

THUS have I at length arrived at the close of my essay, having experienced very many interruptions, from the variety of my avocations, and unexpected occurrences. I presume few books have appeared under more inauspicious circumstances, than the present: written hastily, an hour now, and an hour then, at the intervals of other unavoidable engagements; not so much as once transcribed, appearing in the plain garb of my first thoughts; and, owing to my distance from the press, the proof sheets not corrected by myself. To think that, under these circumstances, it does not possess many defects in style and arrangement, would be arrogating to myself more than the oldest authors and most experienced writers, could, in justice, claim. Conscious, however, of the justness of its contents, the plainness and evidence of the arguments exhibited in it, and the goodness of the cause which it espouses, I was induced to usher it into the public with all its imperfections on its head. Some typographical errors, in orthography and punctuation, in it, are to the generality of readers unimportant, other errors will be noticed in an *arrata*.

With regard to the spirit and temper of mind in which it was written, I can conscientiously say, it was that of benevolence and

andour. If any things ironical or acrimonious have been said, it has been owing, more to a genius naturally inclined to irony, which I have often to deny, than to a spirit of rancour or bitterness, which I am not conscious of possessing towards any party in Christendom. I sincerely pity, and cordially deplore the errors of my pedo-baptist brethren on this important ordinance; not only on account of the perversion of the ordinance, but also on account of its obscuring influence, and beclouding effect, upon their views of the church or kingdom of Christ, its government, its discipline, and I might add, some of its doctrines.

If there be any doctrine or practice that a man may advocate in this day, and in our circumstances, without the fear of the stale charge of priestcraft or worldly interest, I presume it is the subject of the preceding discussion. The number and influence of those whose practice we condemn, are great and overwhelming, in this region at least, and therefore we enter the list, with fearful odds. Imperious circumstances have then constrained us to differ; for in their principles and practice we could never enjoy the testimony of a good conscience. Though this may be esteemed, and called, a great weakness by many, nevertheless it is a weakness of which we cannot divest ourselves. A good conscience we esteem the greatest and best estate.

With regard to those quotations, made to prove the persecuting tendency of our opponent's system, we have again to observe, they were not made with the design of exposing or exasperating our pedo-baptist friends, but to shew them the dangerous tendency of their own principles. We entreat them to consider it in this light, and to remove all suspicion from themselves by disavowing a system, which to themselves never can be a profit, but a real and lasting injury.—The arguments plainly stated in the preceding pages, are more than sufficient to convince any unprejudiced or impartial person of the error we oppose—Yea, the tenth part of the evidence would convince a person, on any other subject in which his present interest was obvious. But our own experience has long since convinced us, that it is very hard to convince a man against his inclination or his interest. Yea, in the same proportion as it is easy to convince him of any thing in which both his inclination and his present interest concur. We trust that some will be convinced and edified in perusing this small treatise, but we are far from thinking that all will be convinced. There are many who will never see otherwise than they do, and these, no doubt, will raise the ancient cry, "Great is Diana of the Ephesians"—"Great is Diana of the Ephesians." Our Saviour himself, who spoke as never man spoke, convinced but comparatively very few. The work of conviction is God's own work; into his hands we resign it, in the assurance that as far as he pleases he will make this effort subservient to his own glory.

In this place I must observe, that I will feel an obligation to the man who will even endeavor, in a proper manner, to convince me of any error in this or in any other part of my religious belief; and I pledge myself fairly to confess, and publicly to own, my conviction, when it shall have taken place. At the same time, if any man shall attempt to pervert or misapply the arguments herein stated, in such a way as to merit notice, he may expect, should his efforts reach my eyes, to undergo an investigation suited to his character and efforts. This justice requires, and it would be unjust to deny

it.—To him that is determined to hold fast his present views, whether right or wrong, I beg leave to address a few words: Friend, if I may call you such, for such you are not to yourself, permit me to ask you the reason of your determination: your honor, your respectability and your interest among men require you to do so. Is this the language of your heart? Be it so—you shall have your reward: men will praise you; they will call you a steady man, not notionate, not whimsical—they will support your interest while it comports with *their own*. What of this if you are in an error? will these things comfort your soul now? Will they animate you on a death-bed? Will they embolden you in the day of judgment? Will the judge say, “Well done good and faithful servant?” No, no; what you now call an *honor* will then be your shame; what you now think a *respectability* you will then account a *disgrace*, and what you now esteem an *interest* will then be your *ruin and eternal loss*. They who now praise you, will then reproach you—yea, what is infinitely worse, you will reproach yourself. The man, perhaps you now despise, you will then envy, and you would think a world too little, a world of fame, of honor, and of wealth, too little, to give in exchange for your soul. Think, O think, of the madness of your determination, of the awful experiment you are about to make, and while it is called to day, harden not your heart.

To you who are halting betwixt two opinions, I would say, “*Read your Bible*.” Trust not in man, nor in the son of man, in whom there is no stay. Man, in his best estate, is altogether vanity—and most of those to whom you might look for counsel, have passions, prejudices and interests, perhaps, not subordinate to the will of Heaven. When you have read the preceding pages, place no implicit confidence in them; though I may be very certain in my own mind of their truth, that will not make them true to you. Again—I say, place no implicit confidence in them, but read your Bible—the New Testament of the Lord and Savior reveals his will, *his whole will*, concerning his own kingdom. What you read there, believe and practice. Think not that I speak of baptism alone; that is but one part, one small part, of his will. And if you believe, that there is a God, “who is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him”—who giveth liberally and upbraideth not—ask, and it shall be given you—seek and ye shall find—knock, and it shall be opened unto you—act according to your knowledge. “Obey the truth”—“hold not the truth in unrighteousness.” Fear not the frown of man—if God is your friend, who can be your foe?

The Bible, best of books. The perfect gift of Heaven. Happy is he who meditateth thereon day and night. Not the gold of Ophir, not the precious things of time, compare with it. The oracles of Heaven. In them is disclosed the full fountain of everlasting love—the counsel of peace, redeeming grace—the unsearchable riches of Christ. The Bible opens a door of hope in Heaven, it banishes despair, it enlivens the drooping spirit, it illumines the dark valley of the shadow of death, and gives us a view of the holiest of all. To read, to understand, to believe, and to practice it—this is salvation; this is life eternal; this is the gift of God. Read it devoutly, and devoutly practice it. Compare things spiritual with things spiritual, and remember the words which you there read, will judge you in the last day. “Now unto him, whose word it is, be glory in the church, through Jesus Christ, now, and world without end.” Amen.

Handwritten signature: J. J. [illegible]
Handwritten text: [illegible]

Dear Gips -

After packing, I find
this left out, and I want
to request it to you. I know
you will be interested in
keeping it.

Yours friend,

E. P. Jones -